REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 706 24 CG 001 916

PARENT AND PEER GROUP PRESSURES TOWARD DEVIANT STUDENT BEHAVIOR.

BY- HILL, ROBERT B.

COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, BUR. OF APPL. SOC. RES.

REPORT NUMBER BR-7-8004 PUB DATE 68
CONTRACT OEC-1-7-078004-0382
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC-$11.24 279P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CHEATING, GRADE 10, *ROLE PERCEPTION, *PEER GROUPS, *SOCIAL INFLUENCES, *FAMILY INFLUENCE, RESEARCH PROJECTS,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT WAS TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING FOUR FACTORS, SIMULTANEOUSLY AND SEPARATELY, AFFECT THE RATES OF CHEATING AMONG 10TH GRADE STUDENTS--(1) INDIVIDUAL ROLE ADAPTATIONS, (2) PEER GROUP INFLUENCE, (3) SOCIAL CONTEXT, AND (4) FAMILY INFLUENCE. A PARADIGM (MERTON'S) THAT RELATES INDIVIDUAL ANOMIA, SOCIAL INTERACTION, COLLECTIVE ANOMIE, AND RATES OF DEVIANCE WAS EMPLOYED. SOME 524 STUDENTS FROM 22 CLASSROOMS IN EIGHT COMMUNITIES OF FOUR TYPES (CITY, SUBURBAN, SMALL TOWN, AND RURAL) WERE SYSTEMATICALLY CLASSIFIED INTO FOUR OF MERTON'S MODES OF ADAPTATIONS (CONFORMITY, RITUALISM, INNOVATION, AND RETREATISM). SOME MAJOR FINDINGS ARE--(1) THE GREATEST PRESSURE FOR CHEATING IS UPON STUDENTS WHO ARE MIDDLE CLASS, AVERAGE OR ABOVE AVERAGE, RESIDENTS OF SMALL TOWNS OR SUBURBS, AND INNOVATORS, (2) SMALL SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES EXIST IN RATES OF CHEATING, AND (3) INDIVIDUAL ADAPTATIONS HAVE STRONG INDEPENDENT EFFECTS UPON CHEATING RATES. (AUTHOR/RD)

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Columbia University
605 West 115th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

The Bureau of Applied Social Research is an instrument of Columbia University's Graduate Faculties for training and research in the social sciences. The Bureau has for many years served as the research laboratory of the Department of Sociology, and it also facilitates social research by students and faculty of other departments and schools of the University. The Bureau's governing board includes representatives from all of the University's social science departments and several professional schools.

The Bureau carries on a program of basic and applied research under grants and commissions from foundations, government agencies, social welfare and other nonprofit organizations, and business firms. In so doing it provides experience on major empirical studies to graduate students and makes available data and facilities for student projects; it provides research facilities to faculty members; it offers training and consultation to visiting scholars, especially from social research institutes in other countries; and it makes the results of its investigations available through publications for lay and scientific audiences.

A bibliography of Bureau books, monographs, articles, unpublished research reports, dissertations, and masters' essays may be obtained from the Bureau's Librarian.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

P.A. 24
BR-7-8004

ED019706

Parent and Peer Group Pressures Toward Deviant Student Behavior

Small Contract Project No. 7-8004

Robert Bernard Hill

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

1968

CG 001 916

The research reported herein was supported by the Small Contract Program of the Bureau of Research, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ABSTRACT

PARENTAL AND PEER GROUP PRESSURES TOWARD DEVIANT STUDENT BEHAVIOR

Robert Bernard Hill

The Problem

The main objective of this study is to determine the extent to which (1) individual role adaptations, (2) peer group influence, (3) social context, and (4) family influence, simultaneously and separately, affect the rates of cheating among tenth grade students. It attempts to achieve this end by employing a paradigm of Merton's that simultaneously relates individual anomia, social interaction, collective anomie, and rates of deviance. Three questions are central to this analysis: (1) Is the relationship between individual role adaptations and deviant behavior tautological? (2) Upon what kinds of students are the greatest pressures for cheating? And (3) are there strong social class differentials in rates of cheating?

The Design

The 524 tenth graders in our sample constitute a sub-sample of a larger survey that interviewed mothers and teachers, as well as students. These students come from 22 classrooms in eight communities, which were reduced to four types: city, suburb, small town and rural.

The students were systematically classified into four of Merton's modes of adaptations: conformity, ritualism, innovation, and retreatism. And Merton's theory of anomie was reconceptualized as a theory of egoism.

Findings

1. With the exception of the rebellion mode, the relationship between modes of adaptation and deviant behavior was not found to be tautological.

Thus the statement, "Conformists exhibit lower rates of deviant behavior than deviants," is a hypothesis, not a definition. The adaptations of rebellion and retreatism were found not to be mutually-exclusive.

2. Greater pressure for cheating were found to be upon: (a) the middle-class rather than on the lower-class strata; (b) on average and above-average students (as measured by their grades and I.Q.) rather than on the below-average students; (c) on students living in small towns and suburbs rather than on those living in cities and rural communities; and (d) on innovators rather than on retreatists, ritualists, or conformists.

3. On the whole, small social class differences were found in rates of cheating among students. There were no differences between the cheating rates of middle-income and low-income students. Rates of cheating were negatively related to classroom SES, but positively related to community SES. The two middle-class community types, the suburbs and small towns, had the highest rates of cheating.

4. Individual adaptations (or anomia), peer group associations, classroom adaptations were found to have strong independent effects upon cheating rates. And egoism was found to be a more appropriate context for the study of cheating behavior than anomie.

Conclusions

1. The adaptation of conformity should be included in all analyses of deviance since conformists also contribute to the range of deviant behavior.

2. Social scientists have three alternatives to anomie--alturism, fatalism, and egoism--that can be used as measures of social context in analyses of deviance.

3. To adequately account for rates of deviance, investigators must assess the simultaneous effects of (a) individual adaptations (or anomia), (b) peer group associations, and (c) collective adaptations (or anomie).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the various individuals who in one way or another made this study possible.

To my supervisors, Professors Allen Barton, and William Goode special thanks are in order for their editorial assistance. I am also indebted to Professors Robert K. Merton, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and David Caplovitz for providing me with the skills to cope with the complex theoretical and methodological aspects of this study.

I am especially grateful to my colleagues at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Drs. David E. Wilder, Nathalie Friedman, and Eva Sandis, for providing encouragement when it was most needed.

And I can never thank enough the duplication room team consisting of Ayele Berhane and Rob Montegue and its incomparable supervisor, Madeline Simonson, who despite the odds, miraculously transformed my manuscript into a finished product.

Of course, I cannot fail to express my deepest appreciation to the Office of Education's Bureau of Research for making the funds possible so that I could undertake this study.

INTRODUCTION

The study of conforming and nonconforming behavior in society has been a major concern of social scientists for generations. Despite the number of investigations on this subject, however, there still does not exist a thriving, general theory of deviant behavior in sociology. This void is as much a consequence of inadequate research procedures as it is a result of poor formulation of testable propositions.

Of the social-psychological theories of deviance currently in use, the one with perhaps the greatest potential for growth--Merton's theory of social structure and anomie--appears to have reached a standstill at this stage in its development. Since its inception in 1938, Merton's theory of anomie has stimulated numerous theoretical and empirical analyses of deviant behavior. An inventory of empirical research and theory on anomie reveals that from 1940 to 1964 there have been at least 76 empirical investigations and 93 theoretical expositions relating to anomie.[1] Although many of these inquiries have made important contributions to the sociology of deviant behavior, they still have not systematically examined many of the central ideas contained in the theory of anomie to Merton's satisfaction.

For the most part, the guideposts that have been provided to facilitate operationalization of this middle-range theory of deviance have been bypassed. Some investigators of anomie have dealt with Merton's formulation in terms of superficial, qualitative descriptions. Others have focussed either on anomie as a collective attribute or on anomia as an individual attribute; but they have not employed the concepts of anomie and anomia simultaneously. Consequently, after reviewing the work listed in the Cole-Zuckerman Inventory, Merton concluded:

---

[1] Stephen Cole and Harriet Zuckerman, "Appendix: Inventory of Empirical and Theoretical Studies of Anomie," in Marshall B. Clinard (ed.) Anomie and Deviant Behavior, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964) pp. 243-311.

> There is not a single empirical investigation of anomie and deviant behavior...that has succeeded in mounting a research design that systematically, rather than impressionistically and qualitatively, includes simultaneous analysis of collectivity, subgroup, and individual attributes in relation to deviant behavior...Instead, this exacting requirement of research tends to be by-passed and...replaced by clinical, qualitative descriptions of the interaction among deviants and of their selection of adaptive responses to anomie.[2]

In addition to noting the lack of a simultaneous treatment of collective and individual attributes of anomie, Merton points out (in the above quote) that not one investigation of anomie has empirically operationalized the most popular of his conceptions: the modes of individual role adaptations--conformity, ritualism, innovation, retreatism and rebellion.

Our inquiry will attempt to meet some of the "exacting requirements" set forth by Merton; its primary aim, therefore, will be to put his four-variable (social context, individual adaptations, social interaction, and deviance) paradigm of deviance to an empirical test. This paradigm, which was made explicit in Merton's most recent essay contained in Clinard's *Anomie and Deviant Behavior*, consists of the following variables:

(1) types of collectivities: the degree of anomie;
(2) types of individuals: exhibiting anomia or not;
(3) patterns of social relations: sustained associations with individuals of like or differing kind; and
(4) rates of deviant (or reciprocally, of conforming) behavior.[3]

---

[2] Robert K. Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," Ibid., pp. 213-242.

[3] Ibid., p. 237.

The decision to use this four-variable model of deviance still left the problem of selecting a strategic research site; in short, the issue was: What kind(s) of deviant behavior should we study--and where?

Although most sociological investigations of deviance have focussed on criminal and delinquent behavior, we decided that an examination of behavior that violates legal norms would not be suitable for our purposes. It was felt that the social class bias of crime and delinquency statistics would preclude a conclusive investigation of a central element in Merton's theory of anomie: the existence of class differentials in rates of deviant behavior. Thus the research site that we selected had to fulfill two requirements: (1) it had to permit non-criminal and non-delinquent forms of deviance to be the focus of study; and (2) it had to have representative samples of lower class and middle class populations.

It was decided that the study of cheating behavior in public school systems fulfilled both of these criteria. Since all students are usually compelled to attend school until they reach the age of 16, it made possible the selection of representative samples of students from lower and middle class levels in schools with a heterogeneous socio-economic composition. These samples would allow the collection of reliable statistics on the degree to which students from different class backgrounds cheated on examinations; thus we would be able to obtain comparative rates of deviant behavior for members of lower class and middle class strata.

This investigation of cheating among students, therefore, was not undertaken because academic dishonesty was viewed as a "social problem" in need of correction; it was precipitated by our concern about the lack of a flourishing, general theory of deviance in sociology. And it appeared to us that systematic utilization of guidelines provided by Merton might lead to important respecifications in his formulation that would advance progress toward an empirically verified social-psychological theory of deviant behavior.

As our indicator of individual anomia (variable two in the paradigm of deviance cited above), we used Merton's modes of individual role adaptations; students were classified into four of the role types: conformity, ritualism, innovation and retreatism. Those classified as "conformists" were considered to be "non-anomics," that is, those students exhibiting low degrees of anomia; on the other hand, those classified as "deviants," (which includes ritualists, innovators, and retreatists) were considered to be the "anomics," that is, those students exhibiting high degrees of anomia. The extent to which the different student role types exhibited rates of cheating behavior was not made part of the typology in order to prevent it from being tautological.

Our measure of anomie on the collectivity level (variable one cited above) was the proportion of students making conformist (or reciprocally, deviant) role adaptations in a classroom. Thus a classroom with a large proportion of conformists was classified as a context exhibiting a "low" degree of anomie, while a classroom with a small proportion of conformists was considered as exhibiting a "high" degree of anomie.

Our measure of patterns of social interaction (variable three in the paradigm cited above) was the degree to which "conformist" and "deviant" students informally associated with peers of like and different role adaptations in such pursuits as studies, extra-curricular activities, athletics, and dating.

More specifically, this study will examine the rates of cheating among tenth grade students attending high schools in New Jersey. The data for this investigation were collected in the spring of 1965 as part of a larger survey which investigated school-community relationships. The total sample for this survey consists of 1392 mothers (of first, fifth and tenth grade students), 283 (first to sixth grade and only high school English) teachers, and 524 students (tenth grade only) from school districts in eight New Jersey communities. The socio-economic characteristics of these eight communities are described below.

Name of Community[a]	Description[c]	Population Size[b]
1) Metropolis	Small city	100,000
2) Suburban Estates	Stable, middle-class suburb	18,000
3) Nouveau Heights	Growing, middle-class suburb	23,000
4) Old Home	Stable, working-class suburb	30,000
5) New Home	Growing, working-class suburb	23,000
6) Resort Town	Middle-class small town	4,000
7) Working Town	Working-class small town	6,000
8) Green Hollow	Rural community	2,500

[a] Pseudonyms have been provided to protect the anonymity of these communities.

[b] The 1960 population of these communities has been rounded off to further provide anonymity for these communities.

[c] The process by which the socio-economic characteristics for each community was derived is described in David E. Wilder and Nathalie Schacter Friedman, "Selecting Ideal-Typical Communities and Gaining Access to Their Schools for Social Research Purposes," New Jersey Project Memorandum #1, October 1965.

The eight communities were classified for our purposes into four types according to their relative size: city, suburb, small town and rural. And this variable of "community size" is used throughout this analysis as our measure of community context.

All eight communities have only one high school; Metropolis, because of its size, has the only comprehensive high school. In seven of the communities (excluding Metropolis) all of the students in two tenth grade English classes were interviewed; one was a "college-preparatory" class and the other, a "non-college preparatory" class. In Metropolis, however, students in four "fast" (or "college-preparatory") classes and four "slow" (or "non-college preparatory) classes were interviewed. This yielded a total of 22 tenth grade English classrooms with 524 students to form the sub-sample for this analysis.

This monograph is divided into eleven chapters. Chapters Four through Nine provide a test of the interrelationships between at least two of the four variables in the paradigm of deviance; Chapter Ten relates these four variables simultaneously. Throughout these chapters, tests are made of various propositions in Merton's theory of anomie. A primary objective is to demonstrate that both sociological and psychological variables must be employed to account for rates of deviant behavior.

The first chapter is a reconceptualization of Durkehim's four societal states: egoism, altruism, fatalism and anomie. Its purpose is to show that Merton's use of the term "anomie," as involving normative conflict, is more aptly described by Durkehim's concept "egoism." An effort is made to demonstrate that egoism as a societal state with a high degree of conflict between norms (in our case, involving the conflict between norms for academic success and those for social success among students) is a more appropriate social context for investigating cheating behavior among students than is the state of anomie, which is characterized by the relative absence of norms. It also points out that Merton's role adaptations are differentially distributed within each of Durkehim's four types; thus states of anomie, egoism, altruism and fatalism can lead to conforming, as well as deviant behavior.

Chapter Two deals with the issue of whether the relationship between role adaptations and deviant behavior is tautological. Is a "conformist" one who exhibits no deviant behavior--by definition; or, is a "conformist" one who exhibits rates of deviance that are usually lower than those exhibited by a "deviant"? Evidence is presented to show that Merton means the latter when he uses the concept of role adaptations. This chapter also describes how Merton derived the four variable paradigm of deviance by incorporating Sutherland's concept of differential association. We also make explicit the propositions from this paradigm that will be tested in the remaining chapters.

Chapter Three describes our operationalization of Merton's typology of role adaptations. Students are classified on the basis of two dimensions: (1) their orientation to the goal of academic success, and (2) their degree of emphasis on the legitimate means (such as doing homework assignments) for achieving that goal. By relating our typology to various forms of deviant behavior such as cheating, lying and cutting school, we demonstrate that it is a reliable measure of deviant behavior among students.

Chapter Four examines the extent to which such individual attributes as family social class, I.Q., sex and race determine role adaptations and cheating behavior. An effort is made to determine whether our data confirm or contradict Merton's predictions concerning the social class origins of particular role adaptations.

Chapter Five attempts to locate the students in the social structure who experience the greatest pressures for deviant behavior. An assessment is made of the degree to which high rates of cheating can be attributed to low grades, low I.Q., and low social class position. The question of whether cheating "pays off" is also dealt with in this chapter; an attempt is made to determine if cheaters, in fact, get higher grades than students who do not cheat.

Chapter Six considers the extent to which such contextual variables as community size, community SES and classroom SES composition can be treated as important sources of individual role adaptations and cheating rates. Individual role adaptations are shown to have strong effects on cheating that are independent of the effects of group or classroom role adaptations. The classroom climate of peer group disapproval of cheating is also shown to be an important determinant of cheating behavior.

Chapters Seven and Eight assess the impact of peer group influence on cheating behavior. More specifically, the effects of peer group norms of disapproval and patterns of peer group association on cheating are examined in Chapter Seven.

Chapter Eight considers the role of peer group status as a source of pressure for deviance. An effort is made to determine whether the more popular students cheat more often or less often than the less popular students. Pressure for cheating among students is shown to be--in part--a consequence of an ambivalent orientation to the conflicting goals of academic and social success. Student role types are employed to demonstrate that important respecifications are needed in Coleman's thesis of the adolescent subculture. Normative dissensus among adolescents is shown to be as great as normative dissensus between adolescents and their parents.

Chapter Nine indicates the degree to which peer group norms, status and associations are determined by community size and students' social class.

The peer group patterns of association, for example, are shown to differ depending upon whether students live in urban, suburban, small town, or rural communities.

Chapter Ten shows the interrelationship between social context, peer group associations, role adaptations and rates of cheating behavior; it presents a direct test of Merton's four-variable paradigm of deviance. The conclusions and theoretical implications of our findings are presented in Chapter Eleven.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Abstract	ii
	Acknowledgments	iv
	Introduction	v
I.	A Reconceptualization of Anomie	I-1
II.	A Paradigm of Deviance	II-1
III.	Modes of Adaptation and Academic Deviance	III-1
IV.	Sources of Role Types and Deviance: Family Influence	IV-1
V.	Pressures for Deviant Behavior	V-1
VI.	Sources of Role Types and Deviance: Social Context	VI-1
VII.	Sources of Role Types and Deviance: Peer Group Associations	VII-1
VIII.	Popularity and Deviant Behavior	VIII-1
IX.	Social Determinants of Peer Group Associations	IX-1
X.	Social Context, Peer Group Associations and Deviance	X-1
XI.	Conclusions and Implications	XI-1
	Bibliography	XII-1

CHAPTER I

"Anomie" was first brought into sociological usage by Emile Durkheim in his monograph, The Division of Labor. This work is not often cited in the literature on anomie since the concept played a relatively minor role in the explanation of occupational differentiation in society. It was not until his study, Suicide, that Durkheim stressed the importance of this environmental characteristic as a major determinant of deviance rates in society. He also observed that three other social contexts -- altruism, egoism, and fatalism -- were influential in producing high suicide rates. But the significance of these latter contexts was underemphasized at the expense of a more detailed treatment of anomie. This is one of the reasons for the dearth of systematic analyses utilizing the societal states of altruism, egoism, and fatalism in the sociological literature.[1]

From Durkheim's time to the present, most theoretical and empirical discussions of deviant behavior in sociology have been dominated by Merton's conception of anomie. Admittedly, this theoretical formulation has succeeded in generating a number of fruitful inquiries into the relationship between social structure and nonconforming behavior. At the same time, however, its monopoly of the field has had the unintended effect of impeding efforts to consider alternative social contexts that may be more important sources of certain forms of deviance than anomie. It has become "ritualistic" for investigators of deviance to ask, "Is anomie a major determinant of this form of deviance or not?" Rarely, if ever, is the question posed in terms of alternatives: "Do contexts exhibiting high degrees of either altruism, egoism, or fatalism account for these rates of deviance more adequately than those with a high degree of anomie?"

In view of the fact that even the proponents of anomie readily acknowledge that their theory does not account for many forms of deviance,[2] it is somewhat surprising to note that the critics of anomie -- despite their large number -- have not offered any alternative context that effectively challenges the dominance of anomie as "the" societal source of deviant behavior. For the most part, these critics have limited themselves to presenting particular "personality," "psychological," or "social interactional" variables to serve as LINKS between anomie and deviance.[3] Few have suggested substitutes for anomie, itself. The major exception is Talcott Parsons who, in his discussion of the structural sources of deviance, sets forth a number of social contexts some of which subsume the context of anomie.[4] We will incorporate aspects of Parsons formulation into our reconceptualization below. It, therefore, appears that an investigation of structural alternatives to anomie is an urgent necessity.

One logical place to begin such an inquiry is with a reconceptualization of Durkheim's original four types of societal states: anomie, altruism, egoism, and fatalism. We will attempt to demonstrate that a respecification of these concepts will provide four alternative social contexts from which social scientists can select the societal state that is most appropriate for analyzing the particular form of deviance that they are investigating.

Anomie

It is important, at the outset, to point out that the ambiguity of Durkheim's description of his four states makes the task of reconceptualizing these concepts a difficult one. Clinard observed in this connection, "Durkheim's use of anomie was far from precise and a careful reading of his work leaves one with some confusion."[5] Parsons also commented on Durkheim's imprecision:

> In the Suicide it will be seen that the terms shift their meaning somewhat. What was meant earlier by egoism is much closer to what anomie comes to mean. The term egoism, on the other hand, is attached to what may be called "social individualism," while altruism is attached not to disinterested motivation in general but to a particular sort of attachment to groups. All this will be discussed in considerable detail below. But the shift in meaning of the terms is distinctly confusing and it is well to warn the reader of it in advance. It is an indication of the fact that Durkheim's own thought was in a process of dynamic development throughout this period and that he had not defined his terms rigorously.[6]

In The Division of Labor, Durkheim used the term "anomie" to describe one of the abnormal forms of the division of labor. This form became evident during industrial and commercial crises, particularly financial failures, as Durkheim notes:

> They (the crises) evince, in effect, that at certain points in the organism certain social functions are not adjusted to one another. . . . If the division of labor does not produce solidarity in all these cases, it is because the relations of the organs are not regulated, because they are in a state of anomy. . . .
>
> (As the consumer market extends itself over the country and the world). . .the producer can no longer embrace the market at a glance. . . . He can no longer see its limits, since it is, so to speak, limitless. Accordingly, production becomes unbridled and unregulated. . . . From this come the crises which periodically disturb economic functions.[7]

In this context, anomie (or "anomy," as Durkheim spelled it) refers to the "lack of regulation" of societal functions. The notion of "limitless" aspirations is also alluded to here. Both of these aspects of anomie were carried over to Durkheim's analysis of suicides.

Durkheim was struck by the fact that suicide rates during periods of economic depression remained just as high during periods of prosperity. Parsons went on to observe:

> Hence, Durkheim questions that even the increase of suicides in depression is due to economic hardship as such, especially in view of the lack of general correlation between suidice and poverty already mentioned. The probability is that the increase, both in prosperity and in depression, is due to the same order of causes.
>
> That cause Durkheim finds in the fact that in both cases large numbers of people are thrown with relative suddenness, out of adjustment with certain important features of their social environment. In depression, expectations relative to the standard of living. . .are frustrated on a large scale. In that of unusual prosperity, on the other hand, things which had seemed altogether outside the range of possibility become for many people realities. . . . The result is a sense of confusion, a loss of orientation. People no longer have the sense that they are "getting anywhere." When large numbers are the recipients of windfalls, having attained what had seemed impossible, they tend no longer to believe anything is impossible. This is, in turn, because human appetites and interests are inherently unlimited. For there to be satisfaction they must be limited, disciplined. It is as an agency of breakdown of this discipline that prosperity is a cause of suicide. It opens up the abyss of an endless search for the impossible.[8]

Durkheim also employed the anomic situation of "change in status" as the explanation for the high suicide rates among the divorced and widowed, as Parsons notes: "Durkheim also attributes to the same thing (anomie) a part in the higher suicide rate of the widowed and divorced as against the married."[9]

Anomie, therefore, can result from (a) a sudden change in economic or marital status, and (b) a lack of discipline or regulation over unrealistic human expectations. Anomic individuals are said to have a "sense of confusion" and a "loss of orientation." A number of social scientists like McClosky and Schaar have characterized such situations as states of "normlessness":

> To Durkheim, anomy meant a condition of de-regulation or relative normlessness in a social group. . .(which) gave men a feeling of wandering through an empty space with no landmarks from which to take a bearing and set a course. . . . Finding no fixed reference points by which to locate itself, the soul tires of its wanderings through a social landscape desolate of norms. The struggle seems futile, life itself loses value, and the result for many is anomic self-destruction.[10]

Merton refers to anomie as the "breakdown of norms." He conceives of this state of "normlessness" as a product of the conflict between cultural norms and institutional means:

> Anomie is then conceived as a breakdown in the cultural structure, occurring particularly when there is an acute disjunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them. . . . The social structure acts as a barrier or as an open door to the acting out of cultural mandates. When the cultural and the social structure are malintegrated, the first calling for behavior and attitudes which the second precludes, there is a strain toward the breakdown of the norms, toward normlessness.[11]

Although Merton's conception of anomie appears to be quite similar to Durkheim's, there are fundamental differences between the two. First of all, while Durkheim was concerned with explaining only suicide rates, Merton applied the concept of anomie to many other forms of deviance, such as delinquency and criminal behavior.

Secondly, while Durkheim wanted to account for deviance (i.e., suicides) among the upper strata, Merton focussed on deviance among the lower strata. Merton, in fact, uses anomie to refer to a society's lack of concern about providing its members of the lower strata with "access to the institutional means" for achieving its lofty goals. Thus, for Merton, the pressure for anomie (and consequently, for deviant behavior) increases as one goes down the social class hierarchy. Durkheim argued, however, that a sudden change in the economic status of individuals made the strain toward anomie upon the upper strata just as great as that upon the lower strata. Merton's formulation fails to answer the key problem for which Durkheim introduced the concept of anomie: the explanation of high rates of deviance among the middle and upper strata who already have access to the society's institutional means. At the same time, Durkheim's conception of anomie applies only to those individuals who have experienced social mobility (whether upward or downward); it does not explicitly account for the high rates of deviance among the "non-mobile" poor or rich.

A third difference between the theoretical formulations of Durkheim and Merton is quite subtle, it is their differential emphasis upon societal goals and means. Durkheim felt that anomie could be significantly reduced when the society regulated or placed limits on the aspirations or goals of individuals. Merton, however, saw anomie diminishing when the society increased the availability of means for members of the lower strata. Merton operated on the assumption that the aspirations of the lower strata were realistic once they were provided with access to the institutional means, while Durkheim assumed that even the aspirations of those who had access to the institutional means were unattainable and needed to be lowered to realistic levels. We will return to a discussion of this differential emphasis later in this paper.

Anomie and Anomia

Another factor that makes the reconceptualization of anomie difficult is that often it is not clear whether a reference is being made to anomie on the psychological level of the individual or on the sociological level of a society or collectivity. Durkheim is quite clear in his conception of anomie as a "state of society."[12] However, sociologists like MacIver prefer to define anomie as:

> . . .the state of mind of one who has been pulled up by his moral roots. . . . The anomic man has become spiritually sterile, responsive only to himself, responsible to no one. He lives on the thin line of sensation between no future and no past.[13]

Leo Srole also conceptualizes anomie as a psychological state. He described it as "the individual's generalized, pervasive sense of 'self-to-others belongingness' at one extreme compared with 'self-to-others distance' and 'self-to-others alienation' at the other pole of the continuum."[14] He constructed a five-item scale to measure the extent to which individuals occupying different social positions experience "normlessness." Srole expressed the items as five questions to identify the anomic person: "Does he feel that (1) community leaders are indifferent to his needs, (2) little can be accomplished in a society whose social order is essentially unpredictable, (3) life goals are receding from him rather than being reached, (4) no one can be counted on for support, and (5) lie is meaningless and futile."[15] Meier and Bell comments that the Srole scale measures despair, hopelessness, and discouragement.[16] The items in his scale seem very similar to those that have gone into scales designed to measure the degree of personal "efficacy" or "powerlessness" among individuals.[17] Thus it is to be expected that the individuals who score highest on his scale of anomie tend to come from the lower strata.

> Investigators who have administered the Srole scale to various samples have uniformly reported that anomy is highest among certain sectors of the population; old people, the widowed, the divorced and separated, persons of low education, those with low incomes and low prestige occupations, people experiencing downward social mobility, Negroes, and foreign-born, farmers and other rural residents. . . .
>
> All the groups just mentioned have one thing in common: they are outside the articulate, prosperous, and successful sectors of the population. . . . Persons who do not share in the life of the articulate and active community are prone to confusion about the norms.[18]

It is of interest to note that of the twelve groups cited above as ranking "high" on anomie only three conform to Durkheim's predictions -- the widowed, the divorced, and the downwardly mobile. These empirical studies have not found anomie to be as high among the upwardly mobile and the prosperous, as Durkheim predicted they would. This discrepancy raises questions about both the tenability of this aspect of Durkheim's formulation of anomie and about the validity of the kind of items that have been traditionally used to measure this phenomenon. Since we are presently concerned with the conception of anomie as a psychological state of mind, we will return to these more peripheral issues at a later point in this article.

In an attempt to resolve the confusion between the psychological and sociological aspects of anomie, Merton suggested that the former be denoted by the terms "anomia," or "subjective anomie," and the latter by "anomie" or "objective anomie."[19] DeGrazia's useful distinction between "simple" and "acute" anomie has also been used by Merton who describes it as follows:

> Simple anomie refers to the state of confusion in a group or society which is subject to conflict between value-systems, resulting in some degree of uneasiness and a sense of separation from the group; acute anomie, to the deterioration and, at the extreme, the disintegration of value-systems, which results in marked anxieties. This has the merit of terminologically earmarking the often stated but sometimes neglected fact that, like other conditions of society, anomie varies in degree and perhaps in kind.[20]

Merton's definition of "simple" anomie introduces a dimension of anomie that differs radically from any of those previously discussed. While acute anomie refers to the Durkheimian notion of an "absence" or "disintegration" of norms, simple anomie refers to a *conflict between norms*. This latter conception is no more than a restatement of the classic situation involving role conflict, where individuals are exposed to "conflicting sets of legitimized role expectations such that complete fulfillment of both is realistically impossible."[21] Dohrenwend also took note of these two "types" of anomie:

> But must the 'absence of norms' be manifested in the 'deregulation' that Durkheim associates with the state of anomie? What about the situation in which rules exist, to be sure, but call for inconsistent or contradictory behavior, without a superordinate rule to reconcile the conflict?[22]

Merton, in fact, appears to gravitate toward the meaning of simple, rather than acute, anomie in his own theoretical formulation. For he defines anomie as being generated by a *conflict* between the cultural structure (i.e., the normative patterns) and the social structure (i.e., the actual stratificational hierarchy); this discrepancy is usually referred to as the "conflict between goals and means." In other words, anomie, for Merton, emanates essentially from a "normative conflict," while for Durkheim it is an outgrowth of the relative *absence* of norms.

With these two dimensions of anomie in mind, let us now consider Durkheim's other types.

Altruism, Egoism, and Fatalism

In a very instructive article, Dohrenwend conceptually delineates Durkheim's four types on the basis of three dimensions: (1) the existence of norms, (2) the content of norms, and (3) the source of normative regulation.[23]

(1) The first dimension clearly distinguishes the state of anomie from the other three types, since the latter are all characterized by the presence of norms, while the former, by their absence. Since Durkheim is dealing with "ideal" or "pure" types, each context is depicted as having the highest degree of the particular trait (whether altruism, egoism, fatalism, or anomie) possible. In the case of anomie, for example, the context is typologically characterized as the complete absence of norms. In this typology, therefore, we are not dealing with real-life states of relative normlessness, but with ideal states of absolute normlessness.

(2) Altruism and egoism are differentiated on the basis of the second dimension, the content of norms. Employing Parsons self-collectivity pattern variable, Dohrenwend describes the norms of the altruistic state as having a "collectivistic" orientation, and the prevailing norms of the egoistic ideal state as having an "individualistic" orientation. Parsons also uses this dimension to contrast these two norm-states:

> Altruistic suicide is a manifestation of a collective conscience which is strong in the sense of subordinating individual to group interests, and which has the particular content of a low

> valuation of individual life relative to group values. . . .
>
> Egoism seems to exist as a factor in suicide so far as people are freed from such group control, while altruism exists so far as the group control is excessively strong in certain respects.[24]

Durkheim's prototype of the "egoistic man" is the Protestant who is "forced to be free":

> . . .the Protestant's freedom from group control is not optional. . . . In so far as he is a Protestant in good standing he must assume this responsibility and exercise his freedom. He cannot devolve it on a church. . . . He is under pressure to be independent, to take his own religious responsibility, while the Catholic is under pressure to submit himself to the authority of the church. . . . The difference lies in the different content of the different value systems. It may safely be inferred that in so far as the high Protestant suicide rate is due to egoism it is a result of the hold over the individual of a collective conscience, a system of beliefs and sentiments common to Protestants, which are not shared by Catholics.[25]

Durkheim's egoistic man bears a sharp resemblance to other societal types that have been described in the literature on individuality in complex societies, like the "inner-directed," the "marginal," and the "alienated" man.[26] His "altruistic man," on the other hand, is similar to the "other-directed," and the "organization" man.[27]

(3) The source of normative regulation, the third dimension, was used to distinguish the state of fatalism from both altruism and egoism. In the states of altruism and egoism, he notes, the overt behavior of its members is governed primarily by their internalization of or assent to the prevailing norms. In the state of fatalism, however, external coercion must be employed to control the overt behavior of its members since they refuse to legitimate its authority. Durkheim depicts the norm-state of fatalism as one of "excessive regulation" and has likened it to slave societies; it is for this reason that he describes

slave suicides as the classic example of fatalistic suicide. It should be pointed out that in Durkheim's prototype of the altruistic state, the army, strong discipline to be sure is also exercised over its members. But, unlike fatalism, it is not perceived as excessive or oppressive. In short, the fatalistic state is based upon what Merton has called "illegitimate authority" -- a situation in which the norms of the subordinates are at sharp variance with those of their superordinates. The parallel situation of "legitimate authority," which prevails in the altruistic and egoistic states, is one in which the norms of the subordinates and superordinates are in accord.[28]

On the basis of his conceptual clarification of Durkheim's types, Dohrenwend concludes:

> Thus the four types can be differentiated, each from every other, in terms of opposite-ness on at least one of three major dimensions: the existence of norms, their content, and their effective source of regulatory power. Both egoism and altruism are characterized by the existence of effective, internalized rules, but the content of the rules is individualistic in the first case and collectivistic in the second. Fatalism stands in strong contrast to egoism and altruism, for its effective source of normative power is an authority external to the social aggregation; nevertheless, all three types involve rules which are binding on the overt behavior of individuals. Anomie, however, appears to be a type apart, as it is marked by the absence of norms altogether.[29]

For the most part, Dohrenwend's clarification of Durkheim's types ends at this point. But the "over-lapping" of different types still leave a number of questions unanswered: (1) "Is egoism really any different from anomie since the individual seems to be thrown on his own resources and is in a state of confusion in both?" and (2) "Isn't the difference between fatalism and altruism really a matter of degree and not of kind since strong discipline is exercised over its members in both cases?" We feel that the "fuzziness" of Dohrenwend's dimensions can be considerably reduced once Parson's classic description of the dominant value-orientations of different social systems is incorporated into this typology.[30] We have summarized Dohrenwend's reconceptualization in the typology below. This typology will be used as the basis for the discussion that follows in the remainder of this essay.

A TYPOLOGY OF DURKHEIM'S SOCIETAL STATES BASED ON
DOHRENWEND'S RECONCEPTUALIZATIONS*

EXISTENCE OF NORMS	SOURCE OF NORMATIVE REGULATION		
	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL
	CONTENT OF NORMS		"Fatalism"
	Collectivistic	Individualistic	
PRESENT	"Altruism"	"Egoism"	
ABSENT	"ANOMIE"		

*Bruce P. Dohrenwend, "Egoism, Altruism, Anomie and Fatalism: A Conceptual Analysis of Durkheim's Types," ASR, Vol. 24, No. 4, August, 1959, pp. 466-473.

Parsons' Types of Social Structure

In his conception of the social system, Parsons describes four types of social structure on the basis of the value orientation that was dominant in each: (1) the universalistic-achievement pattern, (2) the universalistic-ascription pattern, (3) the particularistic-ascription pattern, and (4) the particularistic-achievement pattern. These four normative patterns are the result of the combination of two of Parsons' pattern variables, universalism-particularism and achievement-ascription.[31]

(1) The Universalistic-Achievement Pattern

A social structure that is characterized by the universalistic-achievement normative pattern is one in which a) achievement is a goal in itself, not a means and b) individuals are judged on the basis of individual and not group achievement. Universalized standards and generalized rules are to apply to all individuals equally. Parsons describes this pattern as follows:

> The combination with achievement values, however, places the accent on the valuation of goal-achievement and of instrumental actions leading to such goal-achievement. The choice of goals must be in accord with the universalistic values. Therefore promotion of the welfare of a collectivity as such tends to be ruled out. The collectivity is valued so far as it is necessary to the achievement of intrinsically valued goals. This is the basis of a certain "individualistic" trend in such a value system. . . . This is the type of structure central to what are often called "industrial" societies. . . .
>
> Stratification in terms of an open class system seems to be inherent in this type of society. In order to accord at all with the major value patterns it must be open.[32]

Parsons describes the United States with its "open class" stratification system as most closely approximating the universalistic-achievement type of society.[33] The individualistic normative orientation of this kind of social structure is identical with the dominant norms in systems with a high degree of egoism. We, therefore, may now refer to the normative pattern of egoism as "universalistic-achievement." And, American society may now be characterized as the prototype of an egoistic society. It is now plausible to even suggest that the high rates of deviant behavior prevalent in egoistic systems (or sub-systems) are due to their over-emphasis upon the goal of "achievement" or "success." Let us now turn to the second pattern.

(2) The Universalistic-Ascription Pattern

In the universalistic-ascription type of social structure, universalized rules are employed, as in the preceding case, but they apply to group characteristics. Individual achievement, as Parsons notes, tends to be deemphasized in these structures:

> Achievements, however, are valued instrumentally, not in themselves. . . . There is a strong tendency to collectivism. . . there is a tendency to authoritarianism. . . . The reader will recognize that many of the traits being sketched here seem to fit German social structure. Indeed "conservative" German society seems to be one of the best cases of this type where the accent is on the status quo. . . . There are also certain respects in which Soviet Russia approximates this type. Communism is a utopian-ideal state of affairs to be realized by collective action. . . .
>
> It appears from the above sketches that one way of broadly characterizing the differences between the achievement-universalistically and the ascription-universalistically oriented types of society is to say that the first is "individualistic," the second "collectivistic." This seems broadly true and significant. What we have done is to give a considerably fuller analysis of the factors underlying the application of these terms than is current in common usage. The same is true of the terms authoritarian and anti-authoritarian, which also broadly fit the contrast.[34]

The above formulation of Parsons makes it clear that Durkheim's altruism can be described as a state having a universalistic-ascription normative orientation, as contrasted with the universalistic-achievement orientation of egoism. However, the distinction between altruism and fatalism is still somewhat ambiguous since it appears that the latter could also be said to have a universalistic-ascription orientation. Let us see whether an examination of the third pattern helps to clarify this ambiguity between altruism and fatalism.

(3) The Particularistic-Ascription Pattern

The particularistic-ascription pattern is characterized by a deemphasis of achievement. It, therefore, results in individuals being judged as individuals on the basis of their ascribed characteristics (like race, religion, or social class) rather than on their achievements. This pattern is described by Parsons as follows:

> One might say with such an orientation there would be a preference for a minimum of differentiation beyond what was essentially given in the human situation. . . . The absence of the achievement emphasis even further inhibits the development of instrumental orientations. . . .
>
> Such societies tend to be individualistic rather than collectivistic and non- if not anti-authoritarian. . . . There tends to be a certain lack of concern with the remoter framework of the society unless it is threatened. Similarly, there is no inherent objection to authority so long as it does not interfere too much with expressive freedom, indeed it may be welcomed as a factor of stability. But there is also not the positive incentive to recognize authority as inherent that exists in the cases of positive authoritarianism. The tendency to indifference to larger social issues creates a situation in which authority can become established with relatively little opposition. Hence a suceptibility to "dictatorship" is not uncommon in such a society. The Spanish-American seems to be a good example of this social type.[35]

Although the "fit" between the particularistic-ascription normative pattern and the norms of fatalism is not as ideal as in the preceding two cases, there is still a strong similarity between them. For, the "preference for a minimum of differentiation," "the absence of the achievement emphasis," and "the tendency to indifference to larger social issues," are clearly traits of the fatalistic slave society. The major point of convergence, however, is Parsons' reference to the dimension that Dohrenwend felt was crucial to distinguishing fatalism from both altruism and egoism -- the lack of a "positive incentive to recognize authority as inherent that exists in the cases of positive authoritarianism" (as in the altruistic pattern of universalism-ascription).

Parsons' formulation now permits us to make the difference between fatalism and altruism more clear by citing specific examples of cases that are appropriate for each of the types. Situations with a high degree of fatalism or "excessive regulation" would include slave societies, prisons, military concentration camps, the Jewish ghettoes under Nazism, and Negroes under Southern segregation patterns. As a result, "fatalistic deviance" is most likely to take the form of acts of rebellion, or insubordination. These would include slave suicides, prison suicides, self-immolations like those of the South Vietnamese Buddhist monks, murders of oppressive superiors, slave rebellions, prison riots, uprisings like that of the Warsaw Ghetto, Negro acts of civil disobedience, coup de etat, revolutions, strikes by labor unions, and acts of bureaucratic sabotage (like "work slow-downs"). In all of these cases, the source of normative regulation is external: the reluctantly conforming members do not legitimate the authority of their superordinates.

In such altruistic environments, however, as the armed forces of a nation, the Communist cell, the Jehovah's Witnesses religious sect, the Mafia, or the neighborhood juvenile gang, the normative regulation of behavior is internalized. The members do not feel coerced into behaving in the patterns expected of them by the group. "Altruistic deviance" is most likely to be exhibited in the following types of actions: gangland warfare and killings, political assassinations (such as Lincoln's), military suicides (which include acts of bravery and self-sacrifice), political or military purges, genocide, espionage, delinquent acts of a group, and organized lynchings (of the Ku Klux Klan type).

In order to make proper use of our reconceptualization, however, it is necessary that the particular system or sub-group in question be clearly specified. For example, sub-systems with a high degree of altruism (like the Ku Klux Klan) can co-exist with sub-systems with a high degree of fatalism (as, Southern Negroes in the 1800's) in a larger system with a high degree of egoism (like the United States). It is also important that the particular norms under consideration be made clear.

We will not examine Parsons' fourth type of social structure, the particularistic-achievement pattern, since its normative orientation does not closely approximate any of Durkheim's types as well as the preceding three patterns. The society that most closely resembled this type of structure was Classical China with its traditionalistic emphasis upon the family unit. We shall now attempt to make the contrast between egoism and anomie more evident.

Egoism and Deviant Behavior

Our reconceptualization of the anomie concept left us with two "types" of anomie, acute and simple. "Acute" anomie referred to the Durkheimian notion of an "absence of norms," while "simple" anomie characterized the Mertonian conception of a "normative conflict." We shall now attempt to demonstrate that the latter, simple anomie, is really the state of egoism. Consequently, it will be argued that Merton's theory of "anomie and deviant behavior" is, in fact, a theory of "egoism and deviant behavior."

On several occasions, Parsons notes that Durkheim considered role strain to be a primary source of egoistic suicide:

> . . . by placing the Protestant in a particular relation to his religious group, by placing a particularly heavy load of religious responsibility upon him, strains are created of which in a relatively high proportion of cases, the result is suicide. . . .
>
> Later in the book (i.e., Suicide) Durkheim generalizes this insight and puts forward the view that the leading common moral sentiment of our society is an ethical valuation of individual personality as such. This is the more general phenomenon of which the Protestant version of religious freedom and responsibility is a special case. In so far as this "cult" is present men are under strong social pressure, on the one hand, to "develop their personalities" -- to be independent, responsible and self-respecting. On the other hand, they are equally under pressure to respect others, to shape their own actions so as to be compatible with others attaining the same development of personality.[36]

In the case of the Protestant, egoism results from his inability to conform to the role obligations of his religion. Egoism, in this reconceptualized sense, allows us to bring aspects of role theory, reference group theory, and deviance theory together in one analysis. Merton's concept of "role-set" helps us to explain the dynamics of egoistic situations involving role-conflict.[37]

A role-set refers to the set of role-relationships that one has as a result of occupying one status. For example, the members of the role-set of an individual Protestant might include his minister, his non-church peers, and his family. And, as Merton notes, ". . .to the extent that members of the role-set themselves hold substantially differing statuses, they will tend to have some differing expectations (moral and actuarial) of the conduct appropriate for the status occupant."[38] These "differing expectations" can lead to role-conflict on the part of the status occupant. "Status conflict," on the other hand, is due to conflicting expectations of an individual as a result of occupying two or more statuses, which constitute his "status-set" (i.e., the total number of role-sets held by an individual). A Protestant, for example, whose job requires him to work on Sundays may experience status conflict if he is concerned about living up to the role obligations (which prescribe regular church attendance and no labor on Sundays) of his religion. Simmel refers to status-conflict situations in terms of "cross-pressures" resulting from "multiple group affiliations" of individuals.[31]

On the more generalized level of an individualistic-oriented society, egoism results from conflicting normative patterns. Merton's "discrepancy between cultural goals and means" is one example of role conflict on a societal level. Individuals are urged to become "rich," or "successful," yet because many of them are not provided with the institutional means or resources to achieve these cultural goals role strain or egoism results on a large scale. Egoism, in turn, induces many of these individuals to resort to illegitimate means to achieve the society's success goals. This use of non-institutional means is characterized as "deviant" behavior. "Egoistic deviance" may be manifested in a wide range of proscribed behavior by individuals -- who have internalized the society's achievement goals -- acting alone: most white-collar crimes (such as embezzlement), muggings, petty theft, prostitution, "utilitarian" acts of delinquency, minority group discrimination, and cheating on examinations.

Earlier, we pointed out that while Merton focussed upon institutional means, Durkheim concentrated on the regulation of individual goals as a means of reducing the amount of anomie in a given context. This differential emphasis on goals and means is crucial for distinguishing anomie from egoism. On several occasions, Parsons stressed the fact that Durkheim felt that anomie could be diminished -- not by providing access to means -- but by clearly defining the ends or goals:

> . . .the sense of confusion and frustration in depression seems not so difficult to understand, but why is the reaction to unusual prosperity not increased satisfaction all around, as any utilitarian point of view would take for granted as obvious? Because Durkheim says, a sense of security, of progress towards ends depends not only on adequate command over means, but on clear definition of the ends themselves. . .the discipline must carry moral authority. It takes the form, then, of socially given moral norms by which ends of action are defined. . .the type of discipline formulated by contrast with anomie is of a much more subtle kind. It concerns not only the conditions under which men act in pursuit of their ends but enters into the formulation of the ends themselves. . . .
>
> . . .the concept of anomie emerges into a position of much greater prominence. With it the disciplining function of the collective conscience is extended from the relatively external action of rules (i.e., the means) governing action to the constitution of the ends of action themselves, and thus into the very center of individual personality.[40]

The "lost driver" is one example of an anomic situation in which the ends must be clearly specified. His most pressing desire is to locate someone who can give him directions to his destination. He has the means, his car, but he needs to be oriented in a particular direction. "Orientation" classes on a job, in a school, or as part of some other organization are designed to serve the function of clearly defining ends -- what one is supposed to do -- and to a less degree, how one is to do it. Egoism, however, tends to focus upon the means. A person in an egoistic situation is more concerned with: "How am I to achieve that goal?" While the anomic individual asks, "What is the goal?" or "What am I supposed to do?"

Anomie, in its reconceptualized sense, no longer refers to role conflict situations that result from the inability to conform to clearly defined norms; this has now been defined as egoism. The term "anomie" is now restricted to situations in which strain or confusion results from any one of the following three sources: (1) the virtual absence of social norms, (2) ambiguously defined norms, or (3) an unawareness or ignorance of the existence of clearly defined norms.

Goode provides a number of examples of the first factor, the absence of norms, in his study, After Divorce.[41] A major thesis of this work is that the role of the divorcee in America is not defined:

> In our first chapter, we analyzed in some detail the proposition that contemporary American kinship institutions fail to define the proper behavior for the divorcee, male or female. That is we think of institutions as made of interlocking systems of role obligations and rights. But just what the divorcee ought to do or may demand, in the familial area of action is not specified. We noted also the importance of these institutional gaps for the behavioral and emotional responses of the divorce in the new situation. Lacking such prescriptions, many participants in marital dissolution could be expected to undergo considerable personal disorganization.[42]

Studies of the widowed, the aged, and the American woman indicate that their roles are similarly characterized by a high degree of "normlessness.[43]

The alleged "tension" in the transition stage between childhood and adulthood,popularly called "adolescence," may be said to result from ambiguously defined norms. As a child, one knew what he was supposed to do; when he became an adult, his role obligations, again, were clearly defined. But his role as a teenager was in a state of flux. This "lack of orientation" among adolescents has been documented by a number of studies.[44]

The neophyte serves as our prototype of individuals placed in situations in which they are ignorant or unaware of clearly defined norms that are to govern their behavior. Invariably, the novice (on a new job, for example) exhibits "deviant" (usually "over-conforming") behavior not because the operating norms are absent or ambiguously defined, but because he has not yet been properly socialized by his "veteran" peers (or by his co-workers). In Western motion pictures, such a deviant is referred to as a "tenderfoot"; on college campuses, he is the "freshie." It is with regard to this aspect of anomie that Merton's formulation of the observability and visibility of norms would provide invaluable insight.[45]

Anomie and the Nouveau Riche

This reconceptualization of anomie now permits us to come to terms with Durkheim's "change in status" explanation of anomic suicide. We can now argue that the newly rich and the newly poor become "disoriented" and experience anomie -- not because the society fails to clearly define norms to govern their behavior in their new positions -- but because these individuals are ignorant of the appropriate ways of behaving for their new status. Empirical evidence, however, does not support the view that the newly rich are ignorant of the appropriate norms for that status. On the contrary, there is much data to support the view that as a result of anticipatory socialization, the upwardly mobile internalize many of those norms long before actually attaining this new position.[46] This is not to say, however, that many of the nouveau riche do not experience anomie in their new status. It is undoubtedly true that some of the socially inappropriate ("deviant") behavior manifested by that Broadway heroine, "The Unsinkable Molly Brown," has been duplicated by the nouveau riche in real-life situations -- with less "gusto," of course.

The empirical evidence with regard to the newly poor (i.e., the downwardly mobile) is not as clear **concerning their degree of** ignorance of the norms for the lower status.[47] It should also be pointed out that the least tenable of Durkheim's hypotheses are those relating to the high rates of anomie among the newly rich and the prosperous. Investigations have not found a high degree of anomie among these groups.[48] We feel that this discrepancy between Durkheim's propositions and empirical findings results from Durkheim's having committed the "ecological fallacy." He had observed that the societal suicides rates in periods of economic depression differed very little from the rates in times of prosperity. He then deduced that a similar correlation should hold among individuals; that is, that the suicide rates among the prosperous should not differ significantly from those of the poor. Since Durkheim did not -- and could not, with his census data -- investigate whether his group correlation between societal prosperity and societal rates also held on the level of individual wealth and individual rates, he was not justified in assuming that this correlation did hold on the individual level. He, thus, committed the ecological fallacy.

This is not to say, however, that suicides rates on the societal level during times of prosperity and depression are not the same; they may in fact be quite similar. But we feel that a more tenable explanation can be offered to account for the high suicide rates during times of prosperity than the "change of status" argument.

Since Durkheim was not able to demonstrate that individuals who became wealthy during prosperous times also committed suicide to a large degree, one could argue that the suicide rates among such individuals were, in fact, very low. Yet it would still have been possible to have very high rates of suicide during such periods, if a high degree of relative deprivation prevailed among their less successful friends and peers. Thus, the high suicide rate during prosperity could have come from the strata with frustrated high ambitions: those who witnessed many of their friends become wealthy, yet for one reason or another were not able to do likewise. This explanation in terms of reference group theory would be in accord with empirical findings; it would also explain why none of these studies found high rates of anomie among the upper strata or the nouveau riche. It is quite probable that had Durkheim access to individual data, he also would not have found a high rate of anomie (or suicides) among the prosperous strata.

Since we have included three closely-related situations — the absence of norms, the presence of ambiguously defined norms, and the ignorance of clearly defined norms -- under the rubric of "anomie," the kinds of deviance that can be best understood in the context of anomie are easier to specify. The forms of "anomic deviance" include: 1) most kinds of deviance (such as suicides, mental illness, drug addiction, or alcoholism) among the divorced, the widowed, the downwardly mobile, the aged, and the American woman; and 2) much of the deviance exhibited by newly-weds, and other kinds of neophytes.

We do not mean to imply, however, that deviance among the divorced or newly-wed, for example, cannot be analyzed in the other contexts. On the contrary, if one suspects that the deviance exhibited by a divorcee, for example, is more likely to be due to role conflict between existing norms rather than to the ambiguity, absence, or unawareness of norms, then the context of egoism should be employed. A study investigating cheating behavior in school systems would most likely employ the social context that places a high value on individual achievement -- egoism. Also, since the student is usually perceived as experiencing role conflict from his family, his peers, his close friends, and his teachers, the model of egoistic deviance is most appropriate to employ for this purpose. An investigator of gang delinquency, on the other hand, would use the context of altruism. It cannot be over-emphasized, however, that almost any form of deviant behavior can occur in _any one_ of Durkheim's four contexts. We are only trying to specify which contexts are _most_ appropriate for investigating particular kinds of deviant behavior.

Merton's Modes of Adaptations and Durkheim's Societal Types

Before concluding this essay we would like to note that our reconceptualization allows us to locate Merton's deviant modes of adaptation into the appropriate social contexts of Durkheim.[49] The ritualism adaptation would be expected to occur most frequently in a "bureaucratic" setting in which the importance of the individual is deemphasized; the norm-state of altruism, then, would be the most appropriate context for the study of ritualism. Innovation would clearly fall within the individualistically-oriented context of egoism, while rebellion would occur most frequently in the fatalistic setting. Since anomie implies a type of passive response to or withdrawal from life situations, it would seem to be the context in which the highest rates of retreatism would be expected to occur. It should be clearly understood, however, that these role types of Merton can occur in any one of the four contexts; we are only interested in specifying the context in which a particular role type is most likely to be the "modal" type. This convergence between Merton's role types and Durkheim's societal types should generate new theoretical and empirical insights on the part of social scientists investigating deviant behavior.

It should be pointed out that these social contexts can be employed with respect to predicting conforming, as well as deviant behavior. Since, traditionally, anomie has been dealt with as a source of deviance, investigators have lost sight of the fact that it can be a source of conforming behavior, as well. This duality of Durkheim's types was made evident by his observation that Catholics had a lower rate of suicide than Protestants because the cohesion among Catholics is greater. This indicated that altruistic contexts can produce high rates of conforming, as well as deviant behavior.[50] Egoism, for example, may be responsible for low rates of alcoholism, delinquency, and crime among individuals who experience role-conflict and are afraid to participate in deviant behavior so as not to upset a significant other. High rates of conforming behavior can also emerge in fatalistic societies, if large numbers of its members are docile -- as indeed, they usually are. It should be remembered that these are merely social settings; whether or not high rates of deviance or high rates of conformity will emerge depends upon the intervening variables of group norms, kinds of social interactions, and types of role adaptations that prevail in them.

In the typology representation in the figure on the succeeding page, we have summarized the major points discussed in this paper.

Conclusion

This reconceptualization of Durkheim's original four types of societal states led to the following conclusions:

(1) That egoistic deviance results from normative, role, and status conflicts; altruistic deviance from group allegiance; fatalistic deviance from oppressive rule, and anomic deviance from the absence, ambiguity, or unawareness of social norms.

(2) That Merton's theory of anomie and deviant behavior is, in fact, a theory of egoism and deviant behavior.

(3) That Merton's deviant role adaptations of ritualism, innovation, rebellion and retreatism correspond, respectively, to Durkheim's states of altruism, egoism, fatalism and anomie.

(4) That Durkheim's societal states can be used to predict conforming, as well as deviant behavior.

(5) That social investigators now have four alternative social contexts from which to choose the most appropriate one for analyzing the particular form of deviance they are concerned with.

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="5">EXISTENCE OF NORMS</th><th colspan="3">SOURCE OF NORMATIVE REGULATION</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">INTERNAL</th><th>EXTERNAL</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">CONTENT OF NORMS</th><th rowspan="3">"Fatalism"</th></tr>
<tr><th>Collectivistic</th><th>Individualistic</th></tr>
<tr><th>"Altruism"</th><th>"Egoism"</th></tr>
<tr><td>PRESENT</td><td>A) Altrusia*
B) Normative Pattern: Universalistic-Ascription
C) Mode of Adaptation: Ritualism
D) Source of Deviance: Group Allegiance
E) Examples of "Altruistic Deviance
1) Group crime (Mafia)
2) Gang delinquency
3) Military suicides (i.e., heroic deeds)
4) Political purges
5) Assassinations (like Lincoln's)
6) K.K.K. lynchings
7) Nazi genocide
8) Espionage</td><td>A) Egoisia*
B) Normative Pattern: Universalistic-Achievement
C) Mode of Adaptation: Innovation
D) Source of Deviance: Normative, Role, or Status Conflict
E) Examples of "Egoistic Deviance"
1) Petty theft
2) "White-Collar" crimes
3) Prostitution
4) "Utilitarian" Delinquency by Individuals
5) Minority group discrimination
6) Cheating on examinations</td><td>A) Fatalisa*
B) Normative Pattern: Particularistic-Ascription
C) Mode of Adaptation: Rebellion
D) Source of Deviance: Oppressive Rule
E) Examples of "Fatalistic Deviance"
1) Slave suicides
2) Prison suicides
3) Buddhist self-immolations
4) Slave rebellions
5) Prison riots
6) Warsaw Ghetto Uprising
7) Murder of superiors
8) Coup de etat
9) Revolutions
10) Civil Disobedience
11) Labor strikes
12) "Bureaucratic Sabotage" ("work slowdowns")</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">ABSENT</td><td colspan="3">"ANOMIE"</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">A) Psychological Concept: Anomia*
B) Normative Pattern: None (Absence of Norms)
C) Characteristic Mode of Adaptation: Retreatism
D) Sources of Deviance: Absence, Ambiguity, Unawareness of Norms
E) Examples of "Anomic Deviance"
1) Deviance by divorced, widowed, the elderly, "skidders"
a) Suicides, mental illness, alcoholism, drug addiction
2) Deviance on the part of the nouveau riche (upwardly mobile)
a) Socially inappropriate behavior: "Molly Brown Syndrome"
3) Deviance on part of Neophytes and Adolescents
a) "Over-conforming" of neophytes
b) Adoption of current "fads" by Adolescents</td></tr>
</table>

*Suggested concepts to be used on the psychological level.

Source: Robert B. Hill, "A Reconceptualization of Anomie: A Return to Durkheim's Types."

Footnotes

1. We are only aware of one, Bruce P. Dohrenwend, "Egoism, Altruism, Anomie, and Fatalism: A Conceptual Analysis of Durkheim's Types," American Sociological Review, 24 (August, 1959), pp. 466-473.

2. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1957, pp. 177-178.

3. Alex Inkeles, "Personality and Social Structure," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., editors, Sociology Today, New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 249-276; Robert J. Kleiner and Seymour Parker, "Goal-Striving, Social Status, and Mental Disorder: A Research Review," American Sociological Review, 28 (April, 1963), pp. 189-203; Herbert McClosky and John H. Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 30 (February, 1965), pp. 14-40; Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys, Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1959.

4. Talcott Parsons, "The Social Structure of Deviant Behavior Tendencies," The Social System, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1951, pp. 283-297.

5. Marshall B. Clinard, editor, Anomie and Deviant Behavior, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1964, p. 8.

6. Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1949, pp. 327-328.

7. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, translated by George Simpson, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1947, pp. 354, 368, 370.

8. Parsons, Structure of Social Action, op. cit., pp. 335-336.

9. Ibid., p. 336.

10. McClosky and Schaar, op. cit., p. 15.

11. Merton, op. cit., pp. 162-163.

12. Ibid., p. 161.

13. McClosky and Schaar, op. cit., p. 16.

14. Ibid., p. 16.

15. Clinard, op. cit., p. 35.

16. Ibid.

17. Angus Campbell, P.E. Converse, W.E. Miller, and D.E. Stokes, The American Voter, New York: Wiley, 1960; G.M. Sykes, "The Differential Distribution of Community Knowledge," in Paul K. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss, editors, Cities and Society, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1951, pp. 711-721; Herbert H. Hyman, Political Socialization, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1959.

18. McClosky and Schaar, *op*. *cit*., p. 19.

19. Merton, *op*. *cit*., p. 165; Robert K. Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," in Marshall B. Clinard, *op*. *cit*., pp. 225-228.

20. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Ibid., p. 163.

21. Parsons, *The Social System*, *op*. *cit*., p. 280.

22. Dohrenwend, *op*. *cit*., p. 472.

23. Ibid., pp. 466-473.

24. Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, *op*. *cit*., pp. 330-331.

25. Ibid., pp. 332-333.

26. Everett V. Stonequist, *The Marginal Man*, New York: Scribner's, 1937; David Riesman, with the assistance of Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer, *The Lonely Crowd*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950; Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," *American Sociological Review*, 24, December, 1959, pp. 783-791.

27. David Riesman, ibid.; William H. Whyte, *The Organization Man*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

28. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, *op*. *cit*., pp. 339-340.

29. Dohrenwend, *op*. *cit*., p. 472.

30. Parsons, *The Social System*, *op*. *cit*., pp. 183-199.

31. Ibid., p. 102.

32. Ibid., pp. 183, 188.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid., pp. 191-194.

35. Ibid., pp. 198-199.

36. Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, *op*. *cit*., p. 333.

37. Robert K. Merton, "The Role-Set," *British Journal of Sociology*, 8 (June, 1957), pp. 106-120.

38. Ibid., p. 119.

39. Georg Simmel, "The Web of Group-Affiliations," *Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliation*, translated by Reinhard Bendix, New York: The Free Press, 1955, pp. 146-150.

40. Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, *op. cit.*, pp. 335-338.

41. William J. Goode, *After Divorce*, Glencoe, Ill. The Free Press, 1956.

42. Ibid., p. 204.

43. Robin M. Williams, Jr., *American Society*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965, pp. 65-80; Arnold M. Rose, *Sociology*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965, pp. 625-629.

44. Robin Williams, Jr., Ibid.; Kingsley Davis, "Adolescence and Social Structure," *The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 236, Nov., 1944, pp. 8-15.

45. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, *op. cit.*, pp. 336-357.

46. Ibid., pp. 265-268; Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, *Personal Influence*, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955, pp. 59-65.

47. Seymour M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, "Social Mobility and Occupational Career," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 62 (March, 1952), pp. 494-504; Harold Wilensky and Hugh Edwards, "The Skidder," *ASR*, 24 (April, 1959) pp. 215-231.

48. McClosky and Schaar, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

49. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-157.

50. Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

CHAPTER TWO

A PARADIGM OF DEVIANCE

In the preceding chapter it was suggested that a high degree of egoism was most likely to prevail in social contexts with a universalistic-achievement normative pattern. Since the adaptation of innovation was said to be the modal deviant adaptation in these contexts, cheating on examinations was considered to be an example of egoistic deviance. Thus cheating was viewed as a consequence of conflicting norms, rather than as a result of the absence of norms. This led to the conclusion that egoism is a more appropriate context for the study of cheating behavior than anomie. Therefore, whenever Merton's "anomie" is cited, the concept "egoism" (as reconceptualized in the preceding chapter) should be substituted in its place.

The focus of chapter I was essentially methodological, not theoretical. Its primary objective was to clarify the relevant dimensions of Durkheim's four social contexts as set forth by Dohrenwend; it deliberately avoided consideration of a number of questions that have been raised regarding the adequacy of Merton's theoretical formulation of anomie. This chapter, however, will examine some of those issues.

The main "issue" that we will be concerned with in this chapter, however, is one that has never been made an issue, explicitly. It is the question of whether the relationship between role adaptations and deviant behavior constitutes a tautology. The assumption that this relationship is tautological pervades most investigations that have used role types as part of their analysis. One consequence of making this assumption is that most analysts concentrate on only the deviant adaptations. They assume that individuals making an adaptation of conformity exhibit no deviant behavior -- by definition. Therefore, they argue, there is no need to include the role type of conformity in an examination of deviant behavior; this adaptation, they say, should be reserved for analyses of conforming behavior.

We shall attempt to demonstrate, however, that persons making the adaptation of conformity should, of necessity, be included in analyses of deviance because they also contribute to the high rates of deviance in many social contexts. Likewise, it shall be contended that deviants should be included in investigations of conforming behavior since they also contribute to the rates of conformity. Evidence will be presented to show that although role adaptations and deviance are strongly related to each other, they vary independently. In short, we shall contend that one cannot predict rates of deviance solely on the basis of individual role adaptations; a property that the role adaptations should have if they are tautologically linked with deviant behavior.

At the same time, the source of this confusion about a tautological relationship between role types and deviance will be traced to ambiguities in Merton's original conception of the modes of individual adaptations. But a careful examination of this typology will reveal that Merton does not define the relationship between role adaptations and deviance as a tautology. Furthermore, it shall be shown that his four-variable paradigm is predicated on the fact that individual adaptations (or what he refers to also as "individual anomia") cannot, by themselves, account for rates of deviance. For, as it will appear, if it were possible to predict rates of deviance solely on the basis of individual adaptations (or anomia), the introduction of social context (anomie) and differential association would be superfluous.

In sum, our position will be that deviants do not exhibit high rates of deviant behavior (and conformists do not exhibit high rates of conformity) by definition; but because of the combined effects of social context, patterns of differential association -- and their individual role adaptations -- on their role behavior.

Because the modes of role adaptations are properties of individuals, our resolution of the "tautology" issue will, at the same time, resolve another issue: the charge that Merton's theory of anomie lacks a psychological factor as an intervening variable between social context (anomie) and deviance rates. It shall be shown that the psychological variable of individual rate adaptation was always a central element in Merton's formulation, but that his concentration on the social context of anomie obscured the significance of the role types. This criticism of a lack of an intervening psychological variable in the theory of anomie is also based upon the assumption that role adaptations and deviant behavior are not independent of one another.

The charge, however, that the theory of anomie fails to make explicit the role of social interaction in producing deviance has, as Merton himself admits, much merit. We shall show how Merton attempts to fill this void by incorporating Sutherland's concept of differential association into his paradigm of deviance. We will then examine the components of this paradigm and make explicit some of the propositions that will be tested in the remainder of our analysis.

Role Adaptations and Deviance: A Tautology?

The ambiguity in Merton's description of the role types in its original formulation is perhaps one of the main reasons why, despite its popularity in the sociological literature, the typology of role adaptations has not once been empirically operationalized in its more than 25 years of existence. Yet because these types have been cited so often, even perceptive investigators like McClosky and Schaar assume, erroneously, that "Srole's scale and Merton's typology are the two most widely used research instruments in the study of anomy."[1]

Although McClosky and Schaar could refer to a number of studies that employed the Srole scale, they were not able to cite one empirical analysis that used Merton's typology as a research instrument. In fact, of the 88 empirical studies listed in the Cole-Zuckerman Inventory, only seven were described as using role adaptations as a key variable.[2] But none of these seven used the typology systematically; each examined the types using clinical, qualitative descriptions. Invariably, the adaptation of conformity was excluded from the analysis and the deviant adaptations were examined as dependent, not as intervening variables. Needless to say, there is no reason why role adaptation cannot, and should not, be considered as a dependent variable in empirical analyses. But that all seven inquiries should use the role types as a dependent, rather than as an intervening variable, suggests to us that the assumption of a tautological relationship between role adaptation and deviance may have been the key factor in the decision to make role type, and not deviant behavior, the dependent variable.

That this assumption of tautology is widespread, there can be no doubt; for even Dubin, in his extension of Merton's typology, makes this assumption. He excludes the adaptation of conformity from his analysis because, he says, it is "of no interest in examining the range of deviant behavior."[3] Thus he, also, assumes that individuals making the adaptation of conformity, by definition, exhibit no deviant behavior. We shall, therefore, now examine the source of this confusion: Merton's description of his typology of role adaptations. In Table II.1 below, we present Merton's typology (to which we have added Dubin's revision of the notation for the innovation mode).

TABLE II.1

MERTON'S TYPOLOGY OF MODES OF INDIVIDUAL ADAPTATIONS[a]

Modes of Adaptations	Culture Goals	Institutionalized Means
I. Conformity	+	+
II. Innovation	+	- (±)[b]
III. Ritualism	-	+
IV. Retreatism	-	-
V. Rebellion	±	±

[a] Source: Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 140.

[b] Dubin's revision of innovation in Robert Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, No. 2, April, 1959, p. 148.

Harary's criticism of the role types will be used as a basis for developing this discussion.[4] A number of ambiguities in the role typology are noted by Harary who observes, "the following quotation from Merton sets forth the source of the ambiguities in his typology":

> We here consider five types of adaptation, as these are schematically set out in the following table, where (+) signifies 'acceptance,' (-) signifies 'rejection,' and (±) signifies 'rejection of prevailing values and substitution of new values.'[5]

Harary sees two "sins of notation" in Merton's classification:

> The two sins of notation are (1) use of the same symbol for two or more different ideas, and (2) use of different symbols for the same idea. Both of these sins are committed in Merton's typology. Briefly, the first sin occurs when the minus sign signifies utter indifference in the case of the goals of Ritualism, but rejection with substitution of new objectives in the case of the means of Innovation. The second sin is encountered when the minus sign for Innovation means and the (±) symbol for Rebellion goals and means are endowed with the same significance, viz., rejection with substitution. . . .
>
> Dubin does not see some of the similarities between Retreatism and Innovation on the means dimension. He does suggest (in his Table 1) that Merton really meant to write (±) for Innovation means rather than (--).[6]

Regardless of whether Merton "really meant" to enter the symbolic notation suggested by Dubin, we shall attempt to demonstrate that its omission was fortuitous. Harary asserts that Merton committed sins of notation; we contend, however, that the "sin" lies not in the notations, but in his description of those notations. By calling a "plus" sign "acceptance" and a "minus" sign "rejection," Merton implies that individual orientations to societal goals and means can only be of two kinds: "total acceptance" or "total rejection." Thus Merton (as Harary correctly observed) fails to incorporate the kinds of orientations (like indifference or ambivalence) that "intervene" between total acceptance and total rejection.

Furthermore, "acceptance" and "rejection" of cultural goals and means really differ in degree, not in kind. Few individuals in society "totally" reject (or accept) the prevailing goals and institutional means; they accept or reject them "more" or "less." Consequently, we infer that Merton really meant "degree of acceptance" and "degree of rejection" in his use of the terms "acceptance" and "rejection" to describe the "plus" and "minus" signs of his typology.

However, many observers like Harary interpret "acceptance" and "rejection" as differing qualitatively, not quantitatively. Therefore, he suggests that five, instead of two, symbols are needed to denote these orientations which differ in kind. Instead of "plus" and "minus" for "acceptance" and "rejection," respectively, he uses "p" and "n" to denote, respectively, "positive" and "negative." And, "i," "a," and "r" are used to denote, respectively, "indifference," "ambivalence," and "rejection with replacement."[7] If Merton did intend to denote a difference of kind by using "plus" and "minus," then Harary's notations should be incorporated into Merton's typology. But we do not feel that this was Merton's intention.

We do recommend, however, that because orientations to cultural goals are most often referred to in terms of "commitment," that "degree of commitment" be used instead of "degree of acceptance" (or "degree of rejection"). A "plus" sign, therefore, would denote "a high degree of commitment," while a "minus" sign would denote "a low degree of commitment."

Using this terminology innovators, for example, would be described as individuals having a high degree of commitment to a cultural goal, but a low degree of commitment to the institutional means.

But rewording these notations still does not resolve our problem because of further ambiguities in the typology. The most important one was noted by Dubin in his extension of the paradigm; it is that Merton is not really speaking of "degree of commitment" (or any attitudinal component) in his references to "institutional means," but of actual behavior of individuals:

> Beyond the norms lie illegitimate behaviors. Institutional means, in contrast, are the specific behaviors, prescribed or potential, that lie within the norms established by institutional norms. Institutional means are actual behaviors of people, the things they do in carrying out functions in the institutional setting in which they are acting.[8]

Since Merton commented favorably on this statement by Dubin in his own article (which examined Dubin's reformulation), we can assume that Dubin's definition of "institutional means" agrees with that of Merton.[9] Consequently, we can conclude that when Merton refers to adaptations to *cultural goals*, he is speaking of "degree of commitment." But when he refers to adaptations to institutional means, he is speaking of "the degree of utilization" of institutional means. In other words, the degree to which individuals *exhibit* prescribed (that is, legitimate) behavior is what Merton means by "the degree of acceptance of institutional means." Merton's typology, as Dubin also noted, incorporates both attitudinal and behavioral components of individuals; the orientation to cultural goals is an attitudinal adaptation, while the orientation to institutional means is a behavioral adaptation. Therefore, individual behavior *is* part of Merton's definition of the role typology; but this behavior, as Dubin noted, is "prescribed" and lies "within the norms established by institutional norms." Consequently, *proscribed* behavior (which lies *outside* the norms) is *not* part of Merton's definition of the role adaptations. In short, deviant or illegitimate alternative means have not been incorporated into the modes of adaptation -- or more precisely -- not into the definition of the *first four* role adaptations.

Because Merton denotes the means dimension of innovation by a "minus" sign instead of by the (±) notation used for rebellion, the use of illegitimate alternative means (that is, deviant behavior) is *not* made part of the definition of innovation. Thus Merton does not typologically define innovators as exhibiting deviant behavior; the extent to which deviance is exhibited by innovators is left to be a variable for empirical verification. In short, innovators are only defined as having a low degree of utilization of legitimate means; whether they have a high or low utilization of illegitimate means is left to empirical analysis. This is why we stated earlier that whether or not Merton "really meant" to use the (±) instead of a "minus" (-) sign, the fact that the former was omitted was "fortuitous." In this way, with the exception of rebellion, the role adaptations are not tautologically linked with deviant behavior.

It is also necessary to point out that by not making the "substitution of alternatives" dimension part of the definition for the first four adaptations, Merton has left the degree to which conformists (and ritualists) exhibit deviant behavior as a variable. In short, conformists (as well as ritualists) are also not typologically defined as not exhibiting any deviant behavior. They have only been defined as having a high degree of utilization of institutional (or legitimate) means; the degree to which conformists use illegitimate means is also a variable left for empirical investigation.

It also appears that much of the confusion over Merton's role types has come about because of the addition of the rebellion mode of adaptation. We feel that this adaptation should be dropped for two reasons:

First, because (as Harary noted) its notations are not consistent with those for the remaining types. For example, a "plus" under the means dimension of rebellion refers to "a high utilization of an alternative means," which may or may not be legitimate; but a "plus" under the means dimension for conformists refers to "a high utilization of the original legitimate means."

Secondly, because rebellion is a subtype of retreatism. Since the use of alternative means and the degree of commitment to alternative cultural goals apply to the other three role types (that is, conformity, ritualism, and innovation) as well, we feel that either these modes be subdivided like retreatism or that rebellion be dropped from the typology. Furthermore, by incorporating only the mode of rebellion, Merton neglects to explain why the other three types of retreatism have been excluded from the typology. These types, the "apathetics," "nihilists," and "utopian reformers" are presented with the "rebels" in Table II.2 below.[10]

TABLE II.2

THE FOUR TYPES OF RETREATISM

Types of Retreatism	Original		Alternative	
	Culture Goals	Institutional Means	Culture Goals	Institutional Means
I. Rebellion	-	-	+	+
II. Nihilism	-	-	-	+
III. Utopian Reform	-	-	+	-
IV. Apathy	-	-	-	-

Thus we see that "nihilists" are retreatists who are not commited to a new goal, but have a high utilization of a new means; while "utopian reformers" are retreatists who are highly committed to new goals, but have a low utilization of new means. And the "apathetic" individuals are the "true" retreatists; they are not committed to anything. This table also reveals that by not using a (= =) notation to denote retreatism in his legitimate means."

Secondly, because rebellion is a subtype of retreatism. Since the use of alternative means and the degree of commitment to alternative cultural goals apply to the other three role types (that is, conformity, ritualism, and innovation) as well, we feel that either these modes be subdivided like retreatism or that rebellion be dropped from the typology. Furthermore, by incorporating only the mode of rebellion, Merton neglects to explain why the other three types of retreatism have been excluded from the typology. These types, the "apathetics," "nihilists," and "utopian reformers" are presented with the "rebels" in Table II.2 below.[10]

TABLE II.2

THE FOUR TYPES OF RETREATISM

Types of Retreatism	Original		Alternative	
	Culture Goals	Institutional Means	Culture Goals	Institutional Means
I. Rebellion	-	-	+	+
II. Nihilism	-	-	-	+
III. Utopian Reform	-	-	+	-
IV. Apathy	-	-	-	-

Thus we see that "nihilists" are retreatists who are not commited to a new goal, but have a high utilization of a new means; while "utopian reformers" are retreatists who are highly committed to new goals, but have a low utilization of new means. And the "apathetic" individuals are the "true" retreatists; they are not committed to anything. This table also reveals that by not using a (= =) notation to denote retreatism in his typology, Merton has not made rebellion and retreatism mutually exclusive. Consequently, the addition of the rebellion mode creates a paradigm with over-lapping types: rebellion is subsumed within retreatism and appearing outside of it -- simultaneously. Thus it is impossible to operationalize this paradigm as it now stands; because the same individuals cannot be simultaneously placed in two categories.

To resolve this inconsistency, Merton has three avenues open to him: (1) he can retain the rebellion mode (± ±) as it is, but use the "apathy" symbolism (= =) in place of the (--) notation for retreatism in order to create two mutually exclusive types; or (2) he can subdivide all four adaptations (conformity, ritualism, innovation, and retreatism as retreatism was subdivided in Table II.2, thereby creating 16 modes of adaptation; or (3) he can drop rebellion from his typology and leave his notations for the remaining four adaptations as he originally formulated them. We think that Merton would be most inclined to take the third route.

At any rate, we will not incorporate rebellion as a separate mode of adaptation into our student role types (which will be described in the next chapter). Consequently, academic "rebels" will be subsumed with the academic "retreatists."

Thus far we have shown: (1) that the two dimensions of Merton's role typology are the degree of commitment to culture goals and the degree of utilization of legitimate means; (2) that the degree of utilization of illegitimate alternative means (or deviant behavior) was incorporated only in the definition of rebellion and not in the definition of innovation; (3) that the relationship between deviant behavior and the adaptations of

conformity, ritualism, innovation,

and retreatism is not typologically defined as tautological; and (4) that the adaptations of retreatism and rebellion are over-lapping types.

The reader will note that we have stressed that the relationship between innovation and deviant behavior is not typologically defined as a tautology. This is necessary because Merton's commentary describing the mode of innovation clearly suggests that he might have "really meant" to use the rebellion notation for the means dimension of innovation. But since he did not use that notation we shall operate upon the assumption that he had no intention of doing so. In light of this, one could interpret his emphasis of the extent to which innovators use illegitimate means as a hypothesis -- not as a definition. In fact, they suggest two hypotheses: (1) that the greatest pressures for deviant behavior are experienced by innovators more than any other role type; and (2) that innovators are expected to exhibit higher rates of deviant behavior than any other role type.

It is important to realize that the latter hypothesis has contained within it the following hypothesis relating to conformists: individuals making the adaptation of conformity are expected to exhibit lower rates of deviant behavior than innovators. Merton, however, does not make clear whether the rates of deviance by conformists are higher or lower than the rates of ritualists; the ritualists' trait of "over-conformity," however, suggests that lower deviance rates are hypothesized for conformists. But it is quite clear that Merton has not defined conformists as not exhibiting any deviant behavior. This means that analyses of deviant behavior (like Dubin's) should always include the adaptation of conformity with the adaptations of ritualism, innovation, and retreatism because conformists also contribute to "the range of deviant behavior."

Paradigm of Deviance

The aim of the first half of this chapter was to demonstrate that the relationship between deviant behavior and the role adaptations of conformity, ritualism, innovation, and retreatism was not typologically defined as a tautology. But we can also cite a number of specific references to the role types that support our contention that Merton does not consider this relationship to be a tautology.

After noting that Parsons derived his (Merton's) role adaptations from a more general theory of interaction, Merton commented:

> Such concrete manifestations of reaction to anomic strains as delinquency, crime and suicides, as well as such conceptually intermediate types of responses as innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion thus become classifiable as resultants of certain abstract properties of interaction systems identified by Parsons.[11]

The modes of adaptations are therefore said to be "intermediate" between anomie (that is, "anomic strains") and deviance (that is, "delinquency, crime and suicides"). Thus Merton considers individual adaptations to be a psychological intervening variable between social context and rates of deviance. In fact, Lemert criticizes Merton for treating individual role adaptations as a psychological intervening variable. In a section (of his article) that was labeled, "Intervening Variables in Deviation," Lemert asserts: ". . .some logical exercise or empirical argument seem a preliminary necessity to justify the view, certainly tangential to sociology, that deviation is the result of individual adaptations."[12]

But the strongest bit of evidence supporting our position that Merton considers role adaptations and rates of deviant behavior to vary independently of one another is his four-variable paradigm of deviance. In this model, individual anomia -- which is synonymous with individual role adaptations -- is employed as an intervening variable between anomie and deviance rates. This equation of individual anomia with individual adaptations is made explicit in the following statement by Merton:

> Clearly then, the theory of social structure and anomie requires study of the interaction between deviant and conforming members of collectivities with differing degrees of anomie.[13]

Merton goes on to demonstrate how such a study should be conducted by presenting a table with hypothetical findings; this table was labeled, "Rates of Social Interaction Between Anomics and Non-Anomics in Collectivities Differing in Degree of Anomie."[14] Thus, clearly, "deviants" are to be equated with "anomics," while "conformists" are to be equated with "non-anomics." In short, individual role adaptations can be used as an indicator of individual anomia and vice versa.

It should be noted that the table referred to in the preceding paragraph was, in fact, "Phase Two" of a hypothetical inquiry suggested by Merton for those using his four-variable paradigm. As was mentioned earlier, this paradigm consists of the following variables: collective anomie, patterns of association, individual anomia and deviance rates. For effective use of this paradigm, Merton suggests that three relationships (or "Phases") be made: (1) the simultaneous relation of collective anomie, individual anomia and deviance rates; (2) the simultaneous relation of collective anomie, individual anomia and patterns of association; and (3) the simultaneous relation of collective anomie, patterns of association, individual anomia and deviance rates.

It is during his interpretation of the hypothetical findings for Phase Three that Merton makes the interesting "rediscovery" that conformists (or "non-anomics") also contribute to rates of deviant behavior in social contexts:

> The preceding observations remind us of a theoretical conception that sometimes appears to be lost to view in the literature on anomie and deviant behavior. Individual anomia is related to deviant behavior but non-anomics, albeit a smaller proportion, also contribute to the rate of such behavior. It is only that anomics are more vulnerable to the pressures exerted by collectivities with varying degrees of anomie.[15]

Thus it is clear once again that the statement: "Conformists exhibit lower rates of deviant behavior than deviants," is a hypothesis -- not a definition. In fact, during the course of our investigation the reader will note a number of conditions under which conformists exhibit higher rates of deviance than deviants.

Returning to the paradigm of deviance, it is important to note that it was presented as a three-variable model (collective anomie, individual anomia, and deviance rates) in Merton's 1957 essay. At that time, he suggested that individual anomia (which he called "subjective" anomie) and collective anomie (which he called "objective" anomie) be used simultaneously to predict rates of deviance.

> Growing out of the conception of both subjective and objective components of anomie is the further evident requirement that research on the sources and consequences of anomie deal simultaneously with the interaction of the two types of components. Concretely and illustratively, this means that the behavior of 'anomic' and 'eunomic' (that is, 'non-anomic' or 'conformist') individuals within groups having a designated degree of objective anomie would be systematically compared, just as the behavior of individuals of the same type could be examined in groups with varying degrees of anomie. This kind of research plainly constitutes the next step forward in the study of anomie.[16]

But seven years later, Merton was still unaware of one study that had taken this "next step." Thus another of his guidelines had been ignored.

But we see, however, that the model of deviance described in the 1957 essay consisted of three variables; the concept, "patterns of association," had not yet been incorporated. Thus it is in his 1964 essay that Merton expands this model into a four-variable paradigm.

In answer to Cohen's criticism that the theory of anomie failed to conceive of individual adaptations as a product of social interaction, Merton cites two of his earlier statements (one made in 1956 and another in 1957) on that subject; they indicated that individual anomia among the "initially less vulnerable" individuals resulted from social interaction.[17] Merton then goes on to say:

> The theoretical relevance of these considerations extends beyond the incorporation of social process as a component of the theory of Social Structure and Anomie. It provides a basis for consolidating that theory with Sutherland's earlier theory of differential association as well as with that of the Chicago group of sociologists dealing with juvenile delinquency.[18]

Thus Merton's introduction of the concept "social interaction" in his paradigm links the theory of anomie with both Sutherland's differential association theory and the Chicago school's theory of delinquency. This gives Merton a four-variable paradigm linking anomie, anomia, deviance -- and social interaction. Because these variables are supposed to indicate the process by which anomie leads to deviance, it is necessary to make explicit the temporal sequence of these variables to one another.

Because anomie and deviance are at opposite ends of this "process," it is clear that social interaction and individual anomia are both intervening variables. Thus we must only decide whether social interaction precedes or follows anomia.

In the 1964 essay (as well as in the 1957 essay), Merton describes anomia and social interaction as having reciprocal effects upon one another.[19] He observes that anomie in the collectivity is sufficient to produce a high degree of anomia among the "more vulnerable" individuals; thus social interaction is not conceived as a determinant of anomia among such individuals. But among the "initially less vulnerable" individuals, Merton says that social interaction is the channel by which a high degree of anomia is produced among these persons. (Merton, however, fails to make explicit the criteria for distinguishing "more" vulnerable individuals from the "less" vulnerable.) Thus it would appear that for purposes of empirical analysis, individual anomia (that is, individual role adaptations) should be examined as a product of social interaction. In this way, differential association would be viewed as an important intervening variable between anomie and anomia. This is why in our analysis, we assume a temporal sequence of (1) social context, (2) peer group associations, (3) role adaptations, and (4) deviance rates.

We realize, however, that we are merely "simulating" social process by using this paradigm; for Merton makes it clear that this four-variable model deals only with "one part" of his theory of social structure and anomie:

> For the design of inquiry as developed thus far includes observations on the collectivity, subgroups, individual anomia, and deviant behavior at only one point in time. Yet an empirical inquiry which would deal systematically with a social process must of course include recurrent observations of the changing values and interrelations of variables and attributes over a period of time.[20]

Thus an inherent weakness of this paradigm is that it describes a situation at only one point in time. In fact, it only refers to one stage in a much longer process. If our study were a panel or trend analysis, we would be in a much better position to measure social process. But since no empirical investigation has even examined these four variables, simultaneously, we will employ this paradigm in our analysis. The indicators that we will use in place of Merton's concepts are described in Figure II.1 below.

FIGURE II.1

OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE PARADIGM OF DEVIANCE

MERTON'S CONCEPTS	HILL'S INDICATORS
1) Anomie (in a collectivity)	1) Egoism (Classroom Role Adaptations)
2) Social Interaction	2) Peer Group Associations
3) Individual Anomia ("non-anomics" vs. "anomics")	3) Individual Role Adaptations ("conformists" vs. "deviants")
4) Deviance Rates	4) Cheating Rates

Consequently, we have substituted "egoism" for "anomie," "peer associations" for "social interaction," "role adaptations" for "anomia," and "cheating rates" for "deviance rates." And we assume the following "process": egoism leading to peer group associations, which lead to role adaptations, which lead to deviance rates. When combined, these variables yield the following paradigm:

TABLE II.3

DEVIANCE RATES BY ROLE ADAPTATIONS, PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

Peer Group Association with Deviants	Per Cent Exhibiting Deviant Behavior			
	CLASSROOM ROLE ADAPTATIONS			
	Conformist-Oriented (Low Egoism)		Deviant-Oriented (High Egoism)	
	Mode of Role Adaptation		Mode of Role Adaptation	
	Conformists	Deviants	Conformists	Deviants
LOW	Very Low (1)	Low (3)	Low (5)	Medium (7)
HIGH	Medium (2)	High (4)	High (6)	Very High (8)

This schematic summarizes all of the major propositions that will be tested in our analysis. Some of them are as follows:

1) Among individuals with a low degree of association with deviants, conformists in a deviant-oriented context will exhibit higher rates of deviance than conformists in conformist-oriented contexts. This proposition can be determined by comparing cells (5) and (1), i.e., "low" refers to a rate of deviance that is higher than that denoted by "very low."

2) Among individuals in a conformist-oriented context, conformists with a high degree of association with deviants will exhibit a higher degree of deviant behavior than deviants with a low degree of association with deviants. This is an example of one condition in which conformists exhibit higher rates of deviance than deviants. This proposition can be determined by comparing cells (2) and (3), i.e., "medium" refers to a rate of deviance that is higher than that denoted by "low."

3) Similarly, in deviant-oriented contexts, conformists with a high degree of association with deviants will exhibit higher rates of deviance than deviants with a low degree of association with deviants. This proposition can be determined by comparing the rate in cell (6) with the rate in cell (7), i.e., "high" refers to a rate of deviance that is higher than that denoted by "medium."

4) The highest rate of deviance is expected to appear in cell (8), while the lowest rate of deviance is expected to appear in cell (1).

5) In the conformist-oriented context, the highest rate of deviance should appear in cell (4); and in the deviant-oriented context, the highest rate of deviance should appear in cell (8).

All five of the above propositions will be explicitly tested in chapter X since they involve the simultaneous relationships between the four main variables. In chapters IV through IX, however, we will examine the various two-variable and three-variable interrelationships between our four key variables. One additional variable, however, will be made part of our analysis; we refer to this factor as "family influence." This variable includes the various social-background attributes of individuals such as family income, parental education, ethnicity, sex, I.Q., grades, aspirations, and expectations. Since it is evident (as Merton also noted) that social class variables are essential to an analysis of deviance rates, we have included this cluster of variables in our analysis. For operational purposes, we have placed "family influence" as intervening between social context and peer group associations. As a result, some of the two-variable propositions that will be tested are as follows:

1) Social class is inversely related to cheating rates: the higher the social class, the lower the rate of cheating.

2) Grades and I.Q. are each inversely related to cheating rates: the higher the grades (or I.Q.), the lower the rates of cheating.

3) Peer group associations like studies and extra-curricular activities are inversely related to deviance: the more individuals associate with peers who emphasize studies and extra-curricular activities, the lower their cheating rates.

4) Peer group associations like sports and dating are positively related to deviance rates: the more the association with peers who stress athletics and dating the higher the cheating rates.

5) Social class is positively related to peer group status: the higher the social class, the greater the popularity among peers.

6) Social class is positively related to participation in studies and extra-curricular activities, but is negatively related to participation in sports and dating.

These and many other propositions will be tested in the course of our investigation.

In sum, we have shown that: (1) the two dimensions of Merton's role typology are the degree of commitment to culture goals and the degree of utilization of legitimate means; (2) the degree of utilization of illegitimate alternative means was incorporated only in the definition of rebellion and not in the definition of innovation; (3) the relationship between deviant behavior and the adaptations of conformity, ritualism, innovation, and retreatism is not typologically defined as a tautology; (4) the adaptations of retreatism and rebellion are over-lapping types in Merton's paradigm; (5) the adaptations of rebellion should either be dropped from Merton's paradigm and the notations for the other four types remain as they are, or the notation for "apathy" be used in place of that for general retreatism; (6) if Merton had incorporated Dubin's revision into his typology, he would have made innovators deviant -- by definition; (7) the statement: "Conformists exhibit lower rates of deviant behavior than deviants" is an hypothesis, not a definition; (8) individual role adaptations can be considered as an indicator of individual anomia and vice versa; (9) "deviants" can be equated with "anomics" and "conformists" with "non-anomics"; and (10) the four-variable paradigm of deviance only simulates "process"; it measures the variables at only one point in time.

In the next chapter we will operationalize Merton's typology of adaptations based upon the conclusions reached in this chapter. Consequently, we will not incorporate rebellion as part of our student typology. We will also use an "attitudinal" component to measure the students' "degree of commitment to the goal of academic success." And we will use a "behavioral" (or effort) measure as an indicator of "the degree of utilization of institutional means." And, of course, the degree of cheating behavior by students will not be built into our typology since the degree to which use is made of illegitimate alternative means must be a variable for empirical verification.

Footnotes

1. Herbert McClosky and John H. Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 28 (April, 1963), p. 16.

2. The seven studies were: (a) Matilda White Riley and Samuel H. Flowerman, "Group Relations as a Variable in Communications Research," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 174-80; (b) Richard A. Cloward, "Remarks," in H. L. Witmer and R. Kotinsky (eds.), New Perspectives for Research in Juvenile Delinquency (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956), 80-91; (c) Rose Laub Coser, "Authority and Decision-making in a Hospital: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 56-63; (d) Charles P. Loomis, Social Systems, (Princeton: Van Nostrand Co., 1960), 222-24; (e) Arthur L. Stinchcombe, Social Sources of Rebellion in a High School, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960; (f) Robert W. Marsh, The Mandarins: The Circulation of Elites in China, 1600-1900 (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), 5-9;

3. Robert Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure," American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959), p. 147.

4. Frank Harary, "Merton Revisited: A New Classification for Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review, XXXI (October, 1966), pp. 693-697.

5. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: Free Press, 1949), Chap. 4, quoted in Ibid., p. 694.

6. Ibid., p. 693.

7. Ibid., p. 696.

8. Dubin, op. cit., p. 149.

9. Robert K. Merton, "Social Conformity, Deviation, and Opportunity-Structures," American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959(, p. 178.

10. The labels "nihilism" and "utopian reform" were suggested to us by Dr. Allen H. Barton. The label "apathy" was borrowed from Ponsioen's substruction of Merton's typology in J. A. Ponsioen, The Analysis of Social Change Reconsidered, Publications of the Institute of Social Studies, Series Major, Vol. IV (The Hague: Mounton & Co.), 59-61.

11. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, op. cit., p. 164.

12. Edwin M. Lemert, "Social Structure, Social Control and Deviation," in Marshall B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior (Glencoe: Free Press, 1964), p. 73.

13. Robert K. Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," *Ibid.*, p. 235.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 238.

16. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

17. Clinard, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-235.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 233.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 232-235.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 239.

CHAPTER THREE

MODES OF ADAPTATION AND ACADEMIC DEVIANCE

Because of the amount of criticism that Merton's paradigm of deviant behavior has received, we feel it necessary to briefly reflect upon the basic functions of such typologies.[1] Merton's typology, as Dubin says," . . .is not a theory of how deviant behavior occurs, nor why it occurs. . . . It is simply a descriptive typology of mutually exclusive types of non-conforming (and conforming) behavior."[2] (Dubin, however, is in error when he states that Merton's types are mutually exclusive because we demonstrated in the preceding chapter that retreatism and rebellion are over-lapping types.) Realizing that a theory has little value unless its propositions can be empirically tested, Merson developed this typology of role behavior in order to provide one means by which aspects of his "middle-range" theory of deviance might be tested.

Thus, it is interesting to note that virtually all of the critics of Merton's paradigm take issue with it solely on a theoretical basis, and none of them have attempted to operationalize it using empirical data. They usually contend that either a number of pertinent dimensions have been omitted or that sins of notation were committed. As a result, they expand the paradigm from one consisting of five types to, for example, Harary's 25 cells or Dubin's 14 types.[3] Once they have finished substructing the property-space of Merton's paradigm, their discussion ends; they appear to be oblivious to the important problem of how one would go about using their classification in an empirical analysis. They seem to have lost sight of the primary purpose for its creation -- to provide a means for empirically testing parts of a theoretical formulation of deviance. Most researchers are quite aware of the difficulty involved in trying to operationalize a paradigm consisting of 14 or more cells. Despite the popularity that Merton's paradigm has gained (and the controversy it has created) over the years, we are not aware of an empirical study that has attempted to operationalize it. Although we also, as indicated in chapter II, take exception to aspects of Merton's description of his typology, we intend to demonstrate that it can be quite useful in an empirical analysis of deviant behavior.

I. Operationalization of Merton's Typology

Merton defines an adaptation as deviant when "behavior departs from what is required by cultural goals, or by institutional norms or both."[4] He has made it clear that although his essay, "Social Structure and Anomie," deals with behavior in terms of its orientation to the goal of monetary success, he feels that his theoretical formulation of deviance applies to other cultural goals as well.[5] As we are studying adolescent behavior within a school system, we must determine first, the dominant goals toward which this sytem is oriented and second, the institutional norms that regulate the ways in which students are expected to behave while in school. In order to provide us with a frame of reference for operationalizing our typology, we shall attempt to look at these goals and norms from the perspective of the school officials (teachers, etc.) and not from the students', since the former set the formal standards of behavior in school systems. Let us first consider its primary cultural goals.

Generally, students are rewarded (i.e., praised, given awards, placed on honor rolls, etc.) by school officials if they (1) obtain high grades or

(2) they distinguish themselves in the school's extra-curricular activities (particularly, in the field of athletics). In many schools, students who are athletically or socially successful are rewarded more than those who are academically successful. However, the formal goal that ranks highest in virtually all school systems is providing its students with a good education. Therefore, we shall assume that "academic success" is the primary cultural goal toward which school systems in general are oriented.

The problem of what are the dominant institutional norms of school systems is even more complicated to resolve than is the question of system goals. Norms are supposed to set the boundaries for different types of behavior: if one goes beyond these bounds he is said to be participating in "deviant" behavior, if one remains within its confines, he is said to be exhibiting "conforming" behavior. In reality, however, norms are much more flexible than this statement indicates. Frequently, it is not the particular behavior that is exhibited, but who the individual is (his social class position, for the most part) that is participating in it, that determines whether a behavior is deviant or not. For, as Erikson has noted, "Deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behavior; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audience which directly or indirectly witness them."[6] Thus one must also assess the "normative climate" of the particular social context involved. Since we will deal with the actual measurement of normative climates in a later chapter, we will be guided by what we assume to be the formal institutional norms of school systems. These norms hold, for example, that in order for one to be academically successful, one should (1) do one's homework assignments regularly, (2) try hard to get good grades, and (3) cooperate with the teacher and behave well in class. We define these as institutionally prescribed means by which the cultural goal of academic success can be achieved. Students employing these legitimate forms of behavior can be considered as exhibiting "conforming" behavior, while those employing illegitimate or institutionally proscribed behavior (such as cheating on exams) can be considered as exhibiting "deviant" behavior.

In order to operationalize Merton's paradigm, we first had to select indicators for each of its two dimensions: the individual's "acceptance" (+) or "rejection" (-) of (1) a cultural goal (i.e., academic success, in our case) and (2) the institutional means (such as trying hard to get good grades) for achieving that goal.

In the process of selecting these indicators we decided to change Merton's wording to conform with the recommendations made in chapter II. Thus, our two dimensions are (1) "the degree of commitment to academic success and (2) the degree of utilization of institutionalized means."

We found it difficult to consider an adaptation in terms of the dichotomy of "complete rejection" or "complete acceptance" (allowing for no intermediate value commitments), since hierarchy of values differ in the degree to which one is committed to them. Few, if any, students completely reject the goal of academic success; virtually all of them have some level of success to which they aspire. For example, when the students in our sample were asked, "What is the lowest grade that you would be satisfied with?", no student said that he would be satisfied with a failing grade -- all of them wanted a passing grade of at least "D." This indicates that virtually all of the students had some commitment to the goal of academic success.

The adaptation of rebellion (Adaptation V) will not be reflected in our typology as a separate mode because it is a four-dimensional type that differs significantly from the other four modes of adaptation which are all two-dimensional. Because the inclusion of rebellion in our typology as a separate type would require us to introduce other cultural goals and means besides those referring to academic success, we feel that its inclusion would only confound our presentation.

Only one item was used as an indicator of the first dimension, "the degree of commitment to the goal of academic success." The question was, "How important would you say getting good marks in school is to you -- very important, somewhat important, or not important at all?" Those students replying "very important" (that is, 73% of 505) were classified as placing a "high" (+) emphasis upon the goal of academic success, while all other respondents were characterized as having a "low" (-) commitment to this goal.

With respect to the second dimension, it was decided to construct an index of the degree of utilization of instutional means by scoring responses to the following two questions (the marginal percentages are also presented next to each category):

A) "In general, how hard do you try to get good grades?"
(1) Very hard or Quite a bit--77% or (0) A little, Not at all--24%

B) "About how much time do you spend on homework altogether each night on all your subjects?"
(1) Two or more hours--48% or (0) Less than two hours--52%

To question A, 76% of the students responded "very hard" or "quite a bit"; those students received a score of "1." To question B, the 48% of the students who responded "two hours or more" also received scores of "1." All alternative responses to both questions received "0" scores. Thus the total scores ranged from 0-2; the 58% of the (494) students who received scores of "0-1" were characterized as having a "low" degree of utilization of institutional means. The remaining 42% who received scores of "2" were characterized as having a "high" degree of utilization of institutional means.

This Index of Degree of Utilization of Institutional Means was cross-tabulated with our indicator for the goals dimension and yielded the following typology:

TABLE III.1

A TYPOLOGY OF STUDENT CONFORMING
AND DEVIANT ROLE ADAPTATIONS

Degree of Commitment to Goal of Academic Success	Degree of Utilization of Institutional Means[a]	
	HIGH (+)	LOW (-)
HIGH (+)	"Academic Conformists" (++) (175)	"Academic Innovators" (+-) (189)
LOW (-)	"Academic Ritualists (-+) (35)	"Academic Retreatists" (--) (95)

[a] The numbers at the lower right-hand corner of the four cells refer to the number of students in each category. We classified 494 of the 524 students and 35% of the 494 students are "academic conformists."

It should be remembered that these four modes of adaptations do not refer to student personality types, they refer to kinds of "role behavior" exhibited by individuals in certain social situations while occupying the status of "student."[7] It should also be understood that despite our emphasis upon deviant behavior, our analysis will necessarily include an investigation of the sources of conforming behavior. As Cohen has so aptly put it:

> A theory of deviant behavior not only must account for the occurrence of deviant behavior; it must also account for its failure to occur, or conformity. In fact, the explanation of one necessarily implies the explanation of the other. Therefore, 'the sociology of deviant behavior' is elliptical for 'the sociology of deviant behavior and conformity'; it includes the explanation of the prevention, reduction, and elimination of deviant behavior.[8]

II. Validation of Student Role Typology

We will now try to determine the degree to which the social distribution of our four types correspond to propositions presented by Merton and how they relate to external indicators of "deviant" role behavior. We shall begin with a consideration of the relative size of our types.

A. Relative Size of Role Types

With respect to the relative size of his modes of adaptation, Merton says:

> To the extent that a society is stable, Adaptation One -- conformity to both cultural goals and instutionalized means -- is the most common and widely diffused. Were this not so, the stability and continuity of the society could not be maintained. . . . Just as Adaptation One (conformity) remains the most frequent, Adaptation Four (retreatism: the rejection of cultural goals and institutional means) is probably the least common. People who adapt (or maladapt) in this fashion (as retreatists) are strictly speaking, in the society, but not of it. Sociologically, these constitute the true aliens. Not sharing the common frame of values, they can be included as members of the society only in a fictional sense.[9] (Parentheses and underlinings are ours.)

According to Merton, therefore, our conformists should constitute the largest group, and the retreatists, the smallest. Inspection of Table III.1 above reveals this not to be so with respect to our types. The largest group (189) are the academic innovators, while the smallest are the academic ritualists (35). The number of retreatists (95), on the other hand, are only half as large as the conformists (175). Why is there such a discrepancy between our figures and Merton's descriptions concerning the expected relative size of each of these groups?

It should be noted that in the context of his statements, Merton was referring to the various kinds of adaptations that Americans as a whole make with respect to the goal of monetary success. It is quite probable that the modal adaptation of the populace would be conformity since the "average" American does seem to place a heavy emphasis upon the goal of economic success and also upon the legitimate means (working at an honest job) for achieving this goal. However, the role adaptations in our typology refer to the orientation of students in school systems toward the goal of academic, not monetary, success. The typical student does not place as high a value on academic success, as the average American adult does on monetary success. Consequently, most students do not place a very heavy emphasis upon the means (like spending many hours doing homework assignments) for obtaining this goal. Therefore, one should expect shifts in the relative size of the role adaptations as the cultural goals and the particular context shift.

B. Conformity and Retreatism

We will now test the usefulness of our typology as a scale for measuring conforming and deviant behavior among students. Our four role types will be cross-tabulated with each of the following four items (none of which went into the construction of our typology): (1) whether the student ever cheated on an exam; (2) if he ever cut school; (3) if he ever lied to a teacher; and (4) if he ever wanted to drop out of school. Since the academic conformists constitute our only conforming type, while the other three (ritualists, innovators, and retreatists) are sociologically classified as "deviants," we should expect the conformists to participate in cheating, cutting school, etc., less than any of the other student types.

Table III.2 below reveals this to be so in all four of its relationships

TABLE III.2

RATE OF DEVIANT BEHAVIOR AMONG STUDENT ROLE TYPES

Student Role Types	Per cent of students who:				N
	Cheated on exam	Lied to teacher	Cut school	Wanted to drop out of school	
Conformists	39%	24%	11%	6%	(175)
Ritualists	49	40	24	9	(35)
Innovators	59	42	29	11	(189)
Retreatists	62	47	34	23	(95)
Marginals	52%	37%	23%	11%	(494)

In all four relationships, the academic conformists indeed exhibit the lowest rates of deviant behavior. It is particularly interesting to note (as indicated in the marginals) that 52% of the students report that they have cheated. This finding strongly agrees with Bowers who found that 50% of the college students report that they cheat.[10]

If our typology were reliable we would also expect the retreatists to exhibit the highest rates of deviance with respect to cutting school and wanting to drop out. This expectation, too, is supported by the data in Table III.2, since the retreatists have the highest percentage of students cutting school and wanting to drop out. For example, while 29% of the innovators have cut school, 34% of the retreatists have also cut school. The deviance rate among retreatists differ most from those among the other types with regard to the proportion of students having wanted to drop out of school. Thus it can be seen that our typology closely approximates an ordinal scale of deviance: the closer one gets to the retreatist the higher the deviance rate.

C. Innovation

Merton describes innovation as entailing the use of institutionally *proscribed* means for attaining a culturally valued goal. With respect to the goal of academic success, cheating would be considered as an *illegitimate alternative* to obtaining this goal, as robbing would be an illegitimate avenue to the goal of monetary success. However, cutting school, and wanting to quit school are *not* alternative ways of becoming academically successful, just as becoming a hermit is not an avenue to monetary success. This is a fundamental distinction to keep in mind with regard to the difference in the "means" dimension between the innovator and the retreatist. This also points out the qualitative difference between cheating behavior (which is oriented *toward* the goal of academic success) and the other types (cutting school and wanting to quit school) which are all oriented *away* from the goal of academic success. It is possible for "lying to the teacher," however, to be oriented in either direction since one may lie in order to attain academic success or lie as part of the process in rejecting this goal.

Since cheating should be of more concern to the innovators than to the other two deviant types, we should expect the innovators to exhibit the highest cheating rate. However, the data in Table III.2 reveal this not to be so; while 59% of the innovators cheat, 62% of the retreatists also cheat. What is the explanation for this finding?

First, it could be that *since* the retreatists are not oriented to the goal of academic success, they *must* resort to cheating more frequently than innovators in order to maintain satisfactory grades for their parents.

Second, it should be noted that this is the only relationship of the four presented in Table III.2 in which there is the smallest (and probably not significant, statistically) difference (3%) in the deviance rate between the innovators and the retreatists.

Third, it could be that innovators cheat more often than retreatists under certain conditions. Consequently, the introduction of a third variable may specify those conditions. In the course of this analysis, it will be seen that the introduction of social class, grades, I.Q., in particular, clearly specify conditions under which the cheating rates of innovators are higher than those of retreatists.

D. Ritualism

The ritualist is variosly described by Merton as being the "compulsive conformist," the "over-conforming," or the "bureaucratic virtuoso."[11] It refers to "a pattern of response in which culturally defined aspirations are abandoned while 'one continues to abide almost compulsively by institutional norms'. . .it is something of a terminological quibble to ask whether this represents genuinely deviant behavior."[12]

With respect to our study, the academic ritualist is one who has a low commitment to the goal of academic success, yet places a heavy emphasis on the legitimate means for becoming academically successful. This is a rare adaptation for students to make as one can see from its small number (35). It could be that since we are dealing with school systems, it is difficult to find many students who: (1) are willing to spend lots of time on their homework assignments; and (2) who try hard to get good grades, yet do not believe that the goal of academic success is important. With respect to the goal of monetary success, one could think of a sizable number of Americans who would be content with a nice, honest job without placing a heavy stress on pecuniary success. Consequently, we may have another specification of Merton's description of the size of his role adaptation due to the shifts in social context and the cultural goal under consideration.

Since students making the ritualist adaptation are dubbed as "overconformists," let us determine the extent to which such students in our sample "outconform" the conformists.

TABLE III.3

RATE OF CLASS PARTICIPATION BY STUDENT ROLE TYPES

Student Role Types	Per Cent			N
	(Often) Ask Questions	(Often) Get Enthusiastic	(Rarely or Never) Get Bored	
Conformists	44%	43%	47%	(175)
Ritualists	43	54	57	(35)
Innovators	41	38	35	(189)
Retreatists	37	23	25	(95)
Marginals	41%	38%	39%	(494)

The responses in Table III.3 were obtained by asking the students, "How often do you: (1) ask questions, (2) get bored. . . , (3) get enthusiastic. . .while in your English class?" In two of the above relationships, the ritualists demonstrate a higher degree of class participation (or "conformist" behavior) than do the conformists or any other role type. While 43% of the conformists say they "often" get enthusiastic about something in class, 54% of the ritualists make a similar response. And while 47% of the conformists say they "rarely" or "never" get bored in class, 57% of the ritualists report "rarely" or "never" getting bored in class. On the other hand, about the same proportions of conformists as ritualists say they "often" ask questions in class.

We see, therefore, that on the two items that tap similar "feelings" (that is, enthusiasm and boredom), the ritualists exhibit higher rates than conformists. But conformists ask questions just as often as ritualists. In the course of this analysis, we will find that conformists most frequently exhibit lower rates of deviance than ritualists.

Merton has also described the ritualist as one having "low aspirations":

> The ritualistic type of adaptation can be readily identified. It involves the abandoning or scaling down of the lofty cultural goals of great pecuniary success and rapid social mobility to the point where one's aspirations can be satisfied. But though one rejects the cultural obligation to attempt 'to get ahead in the world,' though one draws in one's horizons, one continues to abide almost compulsively by institutional norms.[13]

If we apply Merton's comments to the goal of academic success, we would expect ritualists to have low college aspirations. Because innovators are committed to the cultural goals, we would expect their aspirations to be higher than the aspirations of ritualists. Thus we hypothesize that a smaller proportion of ritualists than either conformists or innovators aspire to finish four years of college. And since the aspirations of the ritualists are supposed to be "scaled down" to meet their expectations, we also predict that the college expectations of ritualists are lower than those of either conformists or innovators. The data in Table III.4 confirm only part of those hypotheses.

TABLE III.4

COLLEGE ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS BY ROLE TYPES

Student Role Types	Per Cent		Per Cent Difference
	(Wanting 4 years) College Aspirations	(Expecting 4 years) College Expectations	
Conformists	76% (172)	66% (168)	-10%
Ritualists	70 (33)	64 (33)	-6%
Innovators	62 (185)	54 (184)	-8%
Retreatists	47 (90)	38 (88)	-9%
Marginals	65% (480)	54% (473)	

We see that while 76% of the conformists want to finish four years of college, 70% of the ritualists have similar aspirations. Although we had expected the proportions to differ by more than 6%, the proportion of ritualists with high aspirations, nevertheless, is smaller than the proportion of conformists with high college aspirations. And this is what we had predicted. But the proportion of innovators with high college aspirations is smaller than the ritualists; and this is contrary to our expectations. For while 70% of the ritualists have high college aspirations, only 62% of the innovators want to finish four years of college. Thus the aspirational level of the ritualists does not appear to be significantly lower than the level of aspirations of the conformists.

Looking at the college expectations we find the same rank-ordering for the role types: the conformists have the largest proportion of students expecting to complete four years of college; the ritualists, the next largest; and the innovators, next. While 64% of the ritualists, for example, expect to complete four years of college, only 54% of the innovators have similar high college plans. However, the difference between the proportion of conformists with high college plans and that of the ritualists is only two per cent. Thus there appears to be very little difference between both the levels of aspirations and expectations of conformists and ritualists.

Also the percentage differences indicate that there is little difference in the discrepancies between aspirations and expectations among the different role types. The aspirations of the conformists, for example, are 10% higher than their plans, while the proportion of retreatists with high aspirations is 9% higher than the proportion with high expectations. The ritualists, however, have the smallest discrepancy (6%) between those having high aspirations and those with high plans. Thus we could conclude that Merton was correct in asserting that the aspirations of the ritualists most closely correspond with their expectations. But since the percentage differences among the types are so similar we hesitate to draw this conclusion.

As our analysis proceeds, the ritualist will be seen to be very similar to conformists in many ways; but then on a number of other occasions the ritualists will appear to be most like innovators and retreatists. Our findings will indicate that equally strong arguments can be made for either combining ritualists with conformists or for combining them with innovators and retreatists. Thus we have kept them as a separate type throughout this analysis.

E. Role Types and Academic Achievement

Students who are less committed to the goal of academic success should be expected to perform less well, scholastically, than those who are committed to this goal. Thus, another means of testing the reliability of our typology of role adaptations would be to investigate its relation to academic achievement. The construction of our typology would be vindicated if we found that the students who were less oriented to the goal of academic success (as, for example, the retreatists) obtained lower grades than those more oriented to this goal (like the conformists).

TABLE III.5

AVERAGE GRADE BY ROLE TYPES

Current Grade Average	Student Conforming and Deviant Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Marginals
A or B	58%	49%	37%	24%	43%
C	26	34	43	42	36
D or F	16	17	20	34	21
N =	(173)	(35)	(186)	(92)	(486)

The data in Table III.5 show that while 58% of the conformists and 49% of the ritualists have a current grade average of either A or B, only slightly more than a third (37%) of the innovators and less than a fourth (24%) of the retreatists have attained a similar average. This result clearly supports the reliability of our typology of role types. Thus, we can confidently assert that one is more likely to receive high grades if one makes either a conformist or ritualist adaptation rather than an innovative or retreatist adaptation.

F. Self-Perception of Role Behavior

The final item that will be used to validate our typology is a description of six types of students that was presented to each student: Type 1 was "well-behaved. . . ," Type 2 was "smart. . . ," Type 3 was "cooperative and popular. . . ," Type 4 was creative. . . ," Type 5 was "not interested in school. . . ," and Type 6 was "not cooperative. . . ." They were asked to select the student type that "best described" themselves. To confirm the reliability of our role adaptations, the largest proportions of conformists and ritualists should select Type 1 ("well-behaved") as best describing themselves. And, the largest proportion of retreatists should select Type 5 ("not interested") as best describing themselves.

TABLE III.6

SELF-PERCEPTION OF BEHAVIOR TYPES BY STUDENT ROLE TYPES

Student Behavior Types	Per Cent Saying "Best Describes" Themselves				
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Marginals
1 - Well-Behaved	46%	40%	27%	14%	32%
2 - Smart	18	17	15	7	15
3 - Cooperative, Popular	19	31	30	27	25
4 - Creative	16	9	15	20	16
5 - Not Interested	1	3	12	31	11
6 - Not Cooperative	0	0	1	1	1
N =	(174)	(35)	(189)	(95)	(492)

The data presented in Table III.6 fully support both of our expectations. Almost half (46%) of the conformists and 40% of the ritualists select Type 1 as best describing their role behavior. While, the largest number of retreatists (31%) select Type 5 as best typifying themselves. Our classification of these students tend to concur strongly with the way they perceive their own role behavior. This strengthens our belief in both the validity and reliability of our typology as a scale of conforming and deviant behavior for students.

In the next chapter, we will attempt to determine the effect that social class, grades, sex, and other social-background attributes of students have upon their role adaptations and their cheating behavior.

Footnotes

1. Allen H. Barton, "The Concept of Property Space in Social Research," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds), Language of Social Research (New York: Free Press, 1955), pp. 40-53.

2. Robert B. Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure," American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959), p. 163.

3. Ibid.; Frank Harary, "Merton Revisited: A New Classification for Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review, XXXI (October, 1966), pp. 693-697.

4. Robert K. Merton, "Social Conformity, Deviation, and Opportunity-Structures," American Sociological Review, XXIV,(April, 1959), p. 178.

5. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 157.

6. Kai T. Erikson, "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," in William J. Goode, The Dynamics of Modern Society (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), p. 209.

7. Merton, Social Theory, op. cit., p. 140.

8. Albert K. Cohen, "The Study of Social Disorganization and Deviant Behavior," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.), Sociology Today (New York: Basic Books, 1959), pp. 463-464.

9. Merton, Social Theory, op. cit., pp. 141, 153.

10. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control In College (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964), p. 52.

11. Merton, Social Theory, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

12. Ibid., p. 150.

13. Ibid., p. 149-150.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOURCES OF ROLE TYPES AND DEVIANCE: FAMILY INFLUENCE

In the preceding chapter we operationalized Merton's paradigm of individual adaptations; this resulted in a typology that comprised four of his role types: conformity, ritualism, innovation and retreatism. By relating this typology to various kinds of deviant behavior like cheating, lying, cutting school and not doing homework regularly, we were able to demonstrate that it was a reliable measure of deviant behavior. Students who were classified as "conformists," for example, indeed had higher rates of conforming behavior than those students who were classified as "retreatists."

In this and succeeding chapters our primary objective will be to locate the social sources of these role types and of deviant behavior. More specifically, we will determine the extent to which family influence, social context, and peer group associations explain 1) why certain students tend to make one mode of adaptation rather than another, and 2) why rates of deviance tend to be higher among certain role types than others. The first factor, "family influence," will be the primary focus of this chapter. Under this concept we include such individual background factors as social class, I.Q., college aspirations and expectations, sex and race. A secondary objective of this analysis is to demonstrate that role type is a more powerful determinant of deviant behavior than these traditional background variables that are most often employed in sociological analyses.

Throughout this investigation, comparative data from relevant studies will be introduced to reinforce particular findings. Unfortunately, at many points in this analysis we will not be able to cite relevant data since the empirical data on cheating behavior is quite sparse. A bibliography on "Academic Dishonesty" that was recently prepared by the Russell B. Stearns Study at Northeastern University indicates that empirical investigations of cheating, for the most part, have been conducted by educational researchers.[1] In practice, sociologists have not considered cheating to be part of the "sociology of deviant behavior." They have confined their inquiries of adolescent deviance to delinquent or psychologically maladjusted behavior.[2] Bowers' study of cheating among college students is one of the few in the literature conducted by a sociologist.[3]

Consequently, we will be restricted in the number of references to previous work on academic dishonesty. Most of the comparative data that we will use will come from the Bowers study. Reference to this work is also necessitated by the fact that we have replicated many items that were used in this analysis.

Social Class Position

Socio-economic status is considered to be one of the most influential factors in the sociological literature. Empirical research has amply demonstrated that one's chances for achieving positions of status in the larger society depends largely upon the social class position of one's family of orientation.[4] Barber observes in this connection, "the fact of social class differences in life-chances is one of the best established and most meaningful patterns in social life."[5]

The number of investigations confirming the importance of social class as the major factor in the accessibility of educational opportunity has been considerable.[6] After examining a large number of these studies, Lipset and Bendix concluded:

> It is clear, therefore, that although increased educational opportunities have opened the door to mobility for many of the sons of lower-class parents, the large majority are still not able to attend college. Except for those who do attend college, educational attainment comparable to that achieved by the sons of middle-class fathers does not mean an equal chance in the labor market.[7]

Just as extensive as the data that shows the importance of class factors in educational opportunity is the empirical evidence that confirms the existence of class differentials in rates of deviant behavior. Some of this evidence has already been cited in our Introduction.[8] Thus there is much support for Clinard's assertion that probably no single criterion so sharply distinguishes among the specific forms which deviant behavior takes as does status based on social class.[9]

Therefore, the immediate question before us is, "To what extent is social class a determinant of student role adaptations?" On the basis of the educational literature one would expect the middle-class child to make conformist adaptations more often than the lower-class child. The argument that is made to support this position usually goes as follows: since school systems teach middle-class values the students who find them easiest to adapt to should be those from the middle class strata. The lower-class child, on the other hand, should find it more difficult to adjust to middle-class expectations and should therefore perform less well academically than the middle-class child.[10] Allison Davis refers to this difficulty to conform to middle-class school values as a problem of "acculturation," similar to that experienced by members of ethnic minorities.[11]

Thus we would expect an inverse relationship between social class and role types: the lower one's social class, the more likely one is to make a deviant adaptation. Merton, however, is more specific about the class sources of particular modes of adaptation:

> If we should expect lower-class Americans to exhibit Adaptation 2 -- 'innovation' -- to the frustrations enjoined by the prevailing emphasis on large cultural goals and the fact of small social opportunities, we should expect lower-middle class Americans to be heavily represented among those making Adaptation 3, 'ritualism.' For it is in the lower-middle class that parents typically exert continuous pressure upon children to abide by the moral mandates of the society, and where the social climb upward is less likely to meet with success than among the upper-middle-class.[12]

According to Merton therefore the "innovating" students should come from the lower class, and the "ritualists" should be recruited largely from the lower-middle-class. Since the upper-middle-class is successful in achieving high status, it is implied that the conformists should be over-represented in this strata. No particular social strata is specified as the primary source of recruitment for retreatists. Thus it may be that they can come from various social strata. To test Merton's hypotheses we will employ family income and parental education as our measures of social class position.

Family income has been trichotomized into "high," "medium," and "low." "High" income refers to those families whose annual income is $15,000 or more; "medium" income includes families earning between $6,000 to less than $15,000; "low" income to those families earning less than $6,000. Parental education has been divided into "college-educated" and "non-college-educated." The "college-educated" families refer to those in which at least one of the parents attended college; the "non-college-educated" families are those in which neither of the parents attended college. In order to make finer distinctions between the various class strata, we have combined these two indicators of class into an index consisting of six socio-economic types. For operational purposes, we have placed each of these six types into one of the following four categories: "upper-middle," "middle-middle," "lower-middle," and "lower-class." The families, for example, which are college-educated and have a "medium" income are described as "middle-middle" class, while the "non-college" families with "medium" income are classified as "lower-middle." In Table IV.1 below we indicate how socio-economic status is related to student role types.

TABLE IV.1

ROLE TYPE BY PARENTAL EDUCATION AND FAMILY INCOME

Index of Education-Income	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
College-Educated					
1) High ($15,000+) "Upper-Middle"	48%	5%	32%	15%	(60)
2) Medium ($6-14,000) "Middle-Middle"	41	9	31	19	(85)
3) Low (Under $6,000) "Lower-Middle"	44	11	33	11	(9)
Non-College-Educated					
4) High ($15,000+) "Middle-Middle"	33	11	33	22	(9)
5) Medium ($6-14,000) "Lower-Middle"	31	6	47	16	(94)
6) Low (Under $6,000) "Lower-Class"	41	5	34	20	(59)
Per Cent Difference[a]	-7%	0%	+2%	+5%	

[a] Unless otherwise indicated, "per cent difference" will refer to the difference in percentages between the extreme categories. In this case, the difference is between categories six and one.

First of all, that the per cent differences become positive as one moves from the conformists to the retreatists indicates a tendency for the more deviant adaptations to come from the lower socio-economic strata. Secondly, a search for the largest percentage within each role type reveals the following: 1) that the largest percentage (48%) of conformists come from the "upper-middle" category; 2) that the largest per cent (11%) of ritualists come from both the "middle-middle" and "lower-middle" levels; 3) that the largest per cent of innovators (47%) come from the "lower-middle" level; and 4) that the largest per cent of retreatists (22%) come from the "middle-middle" stratum. The "upper-middle" source for conformists and the "lower-middle" source for ritualists confirm Merton's predictions with regard to these types. However, while the "lower-class" does not appear to be the primary strata for recruiting innovators -- as Merton also predicted -- it is the most important (34%) secondary source for innovators. In the Figure below we have summarized these findings in terms of the primary and secondary sources of our role types.

FIGURE IV.1

SOCIO-ECONOMIC SOURCES OF ROLE TYPES

Role Type	Primary Source	Secondary Source
Conformists	"Upper-Middle"[a]	"Lower-Middle"
Ritualists	"Lower-Middle"[a] or "Middle-Middle"	
Innovators	"Lower-Middle"	"Lower Class"[a]
Retreatists	"Middle-Middle"	"Lower Class"

[a] These classifications coincide with Merton's predictions.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to what we are led to expect, the "lower class" is not a primary source of recruitment for any of the three deviant adaptations. This leads one to suspect that perhaps greater pressure for academic deviance is exerted on the middle-class child (whether "middle-middle" or "lower-middle") than the "lower class" child. If such is the case, this would run counter to Merton's proposition that pressure for deviance increases as one goes down the class hierarchy. Since this hypothesis will be tested at length in the next chapter, we will examine the effect of our next factor, I.Q., on role adaptation.

Student I.Q.

Of all the factors affecting academic achievement, student "ability" or "intelligence" is said to be the most influential by many investigators. Boocock comments on its significance as follows:

> It seems to be one of the most established findings in the literature that intelligence is strongly related to academic achievement probably more so than any other single factor. For example, Rossi claims that it accounts for forty to sixty per cent of the variation in student performance, and that if intelligence is held constant, relationships between achievement and other variables are reduced.[13]

Sibley noted that for high school students intelligence was a more influential determinant of educational achievement than family social class:

> At the ninth-grade and at the twelfth-grade level, father's status has less influence than intelligence on educational opportunity; but at the college level, the situation is sharply reversed.
>
> These statistics indicate that as a boy passes through the educational sifting process, his parents' status assumes increasing importance, both absolutely and in comparison with his own intelligence, as a factor influencing his chances of continuing his preparation for one of the more advantageous vocations.[14]

Consequently, we would expect students with high I.Q.'s to make the conformist adaptation more frequently than students with low I.Q.'s. Thus another inverse relationship is hypothesized: the lower the I.Q. level, the more deviant the role adaptation. Table IV.2 shows the relationship between I.Q. and role type.

TABLE IV.2

ROLE TYPE BY STUDENT I.Q.

Student I.Q.	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
1) 121-164	41%	13%	32%	14%	(97)
2) 111-120	38	5	36	21	(128)
3) 100-110	26	6	39	29	(116)
4) 61-99	35	6	47	12	(122)
Per Cent Difference	-6%	-7%	+15%	-2%	

Contrary to our expectations, the percentage differences do not linearly increase to positive values as one moves from the conformists to the retreatists. Is is true that for the innovators the percentage increase as the student I.Q. decreases; it goes from 32% among the highest I.Q. level to 47% among the lowest I.Q. level. However, while 14 per cent of the students with I.Q.'s between 121-164 are retreatists, two per cent less are retreatists among the 61-99 I.Q. students. The highest per cent (29%) of retreatists, nevertheless, is found in the "average" I.Q. level of 100-110. For conformists and ritualists, on the other hand, the highest percentage fall in the highest I.Q. category of 121-164. Thus the conformists and ritualists have a disproportionately high number of above-average I.Q. students; the innovators have a disproportionately high number of below-average students; and the retreatists, of average I.Q. students. This also reveals that the "most deviant" of the deviant adaptations -- the retreatists -- are not the students with the "lowest" abilities; in short, they probably "withdraw" from academic pursuits for reasons other than lack of ability. That they do not have the lowest I.Q. might be expected, since the retreatists were found to be recruited primarily from the "middle-middle" class stratum. The high proportion of below-average I.Q.'s among the innovators is also to be expected since they tend to be recruited primarily from the "lower-middle" level and, secondarily, from the "lower class" stratum.

Aspirations and Expectations

The discrepancy between "lofty aspirations and limited expectations" is considered by Merton to be the major source of strain in society that accounts for the differential rates of deviant behavior among the various class strata.[15] Those who find that the society blocks their access to the legitimate means for attaining the society's goals are constrained to resort to illegitimate means to achieve these ends. Similarly, students who want to attend college but realize that their chances of doing so are slim may either "innovate" by cheating in order to obtain grades satisfactory for college admittance or "retreat" by scaling down their aspirations. In general, one would expect conformists and ritualists to be more college-oriented than innovators and retreatists.

In order to test the importance of discrepancy and lack of discrepancy between aspirations and expectations we constructed a "College-Aspirations-Plans Index." Students who wanted or expected to complete four years of college were characterized as having "high" college aspirations or expectations. Responses of "some college" or less were classified as "low" aspirations or plans. When combined these two dichotomies yield the following four groups of students. (1) those with high college aspirations and high plans; (2) those with low aspirations and high plans; (3) those with high aspirations and low plans; and (4) those with low aspirations and low plans. The third category of students is the one most closely resembling the classic anomic situation of "lofty aspirations and limited expectations." In this category, we would expect to find a higher proportion of deviant adaptations than in the first category of "high aspirations and high plans."

TABLE IV.3

ROLE TYPE BY COLLEGE ASPIRATIONS-PLANS INDEX

Student Aspirations-Plans Index	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
1) High Aspirations-High Plans	43%	8%	37%	12%	(258)
2) Low Aspirations-High Plans	a	a	a	a	(6)
3) High Aspirations-Low Plans	40	4	37	19	(52)
4) Low Aspirations-Low Plans	24	6	41	31	(166)
Per Cent Difference	-19%	-2%	+4%	+18%	

[a]Since the base figure is only 6, we have omitted these percentages

An inverse relationship clearly exists between the aspirations-plans index and student role type: the lower the aspirational-expectations level, the larger the proportion of students making deviant adaptations. There is a 19% decrease in the proportion of conformists as one goes from the first (the "high-high") to the fourth (the "low-low") category, while there is an 18% increase in the proportion of retreatists over the same categories. With regard to the "anomic" third category (the "high-low"), however, there is surprisingly not much difference between the per cent in that category and that of the first category for neither conformists nor innovators. Among the conformists, for example, only a three per cent difference exists between the first and third categories; for ritualists, a four per cent difference; for innovators, no difference. Only the retreatists have the largest per cent difference (7%). Thus it appears that conformists have about the same chance as innovators of holding discrepant aspirations and expectations. So while it is clear that conformists and ritualists tend to have higher college aspirations and expectations than innovators and retreatists, it also appears evident that conformists are just as likely as innovators to combine high aspirations with low expectations.

Sex

Most studies of high school students have demonstrated that sex is related to academic performance: girls, invariably, get higher grades than boys.[16] They also tend to cooperate with the teacher more than boys. It is to be expected that a higher proportion of girls than boys would make the adaptation of conformity. The data in Table IV.4 reveals this to be so.

Slightly more than one-fourth (28%) of the boys are conformists, but almost half (44%) of the girls are conformists. Girls also tend to be ritualists more than boys. On the other hand, boys are more often innovators than girls. But, surprisingly, girls have just as much chance of becoming retreatists as boys. Sex, consequently, is clearly a factor in

TABLE IV.4

ROLE TYPE BY SEX

Students' Sex	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Male	28%	6%	46%	20%	(274)
Female	44	9	29	18	(220)
Per Cent Difference	+16%	+3%	-17%	-2%	

students making either a conformist or innovative adaptation, but is a less influential determinant of ritualistic or retreatist adaptations.

Race

Empirical research demonstrates that ethnicity is strongly related to educational opportunity and academic performance. In general, members of ethnic minorities perform less well academically than members of majority groups. Studies have found, for example, that 1) a higher proportion of Negroes than whites drop out of high school; 2) that Negroes tend to have lower I.Q.'s than white students; and 3) that Negroes get lower grades.[17] In view of these findings, one would expect a higher proportion of Negroes than whites to make deviant adaptations.

TABLE IV.5

ROLE TYPE BY RACE

Student's Race	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
White	35%	6%	38%	21%	(448)
Negro	33	15	44	8	(48)
Per Cent Difference	-2%	+9%	+6%	-13%	

The effect of race on role type as shown in Table IV.5 is not as great as we had expected. The 2% difference in the proportions of white and Negro students making a conformist adaptation indicates that Negroes and whites have the same chances of becoming conformists. This is not true, however, with regard to ritualism and retreatism. Negroes are more likely than whites to become ritualists, but -- and this is more surprising -- whites are more likely to be retreatists than Negroes. That Negroes are less likely than whites to be retreatists contradicts the popular image that comes from the educational literature: Negroes coming from lower-class backgrounds find it difficult to adjust to the middle-class expectations of the school; they therefore withdraw or "retreat" from the system mentally, if not physically. Yet how are we to explain this unexpected finding?

One explanation is that the Negroes in our sample may be atypical: they may come from middle, not lower-class backgrounds. Therefore they may be a college-oriented group that obtains higher grades than the average lower-class Negro. However, an inspection of their social class position and their grades indicates that this is not so. While less than one-fourth

(23%) of the white students in our sample come from families with incomes below $6,000, three-fourths of the Negroes come from families having incomes in that range. Furthermore, while 55% of the white students come from families in which neither of the parents attended college, 70% of the Negroes have non-college educated parents. With respect to grades the racial differences are much larger: 45% of the white students have a grade average of B or higher, but only 10% of the Negroes have similar grade averages. Thus, far from being atypical, the Negroes in our sample are quite "typical."

One other explanation that might account for these findings is the possibility that the climate of the high school that they attend could have affected these results. All of the Negroes in our sample attend the _same_ high school in Metropolis, a city with a population over 100,000. Since this high school has the largest proportion of conformists out of the eight high schools, it is possible that the Negroes in our sample have "conformed" to this dominant adaptation of conformity. However, since we will examine the effect of community and school context on student role type and behavior, we will move on to a consideration of the major dependent variable of this study -- cheating behavior.

Income and Cheating

Since we found that high income students become conformists more frequently than low income students, we would expect high income students to participate in cheating less frequently. In his study of dishonesty among college students, however, Bowers found that level of income was not related to rates of cheating. He obtained only a 2% difference between the cheating rate of students whose family income was below $5,000 and that of students whose family income was $15,000 or more. Thus he concluded:

> . . .there is no relationship between parents' income and college cheating in the total sample. . . . Thus, social class as reflected in parents' income plays little or no part in determining the student's likelihood of cheating in college.[18]

Our data, however, does reveal a strong effect of income on cheating. These data are presented in Table IV.6 below along with Bowers'. (We have combined the income categories between $5 to $14,000 for the Bowers data in order to facilitate comparison with our results.)

TABLE IV.6

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME

Bowers College Data		Hill's H.S. Data	
Family Income	Cheating	Family Income	Cheating
$15,000 and over	48% (853)	$15,000 and over	37% (76)
$5 - $14,000	51% (2655)	$6 - $14,000	57% (189)
Less than $5,000	50% (793)	Less than $6,000	54% (99)
Per Cent Difference	+2%	Per Cent Difference	+17%

In our data, there is a 17% difference in the rate of cheating between the highest and lowest income categories, as compared to the 2% difference for Bowers data. That there is a discrepancy between Bowers findings and our own could be a result of our different samples, with his consisting of college students and ours of high school students. On the other hand, this discrepancy may be due to factors other than sample composition. For it should be recalled that in the preceding chapter, we found no difference between the cheating rate (50%) of Bowers' college students and that (52%) of our high school students. At any rate, it is clear that income is related to cheating among high school students.

But, it should be noted, this relationship is not linear, but curvilinear. The middle income (that is between $6 to $14,000) students have the highest rate (57%) of cheating; the lower income students have a slightly lower rate of 54%. Since this difference is only 3 per cent, it is questionable whether this relationship can really be considered to be curvilinear. The main point, in any event, is that there is little difference in the cheating rates of middle and low income students. This raises the question we posed earlier, "Is the pressure for cheating behavior linear or curvilinear?" We will devote the entire next chapter to an examination of this question.

Education and Cheating

Bowers also found that parental education had no significant effect on cheating among college students.[19] Using father's education, he obtained a difference of only 6% between the cheating rate (45%) of students whose fathers were college graduates and that (51%) of students whose fathers had not finished high school. A similar difference of 9% was obtained between these two educational levels using mother's education. In Table IV.7 we combined Bowers' figures into two categories, "some college" and "no college" education, to facilitate comparison between the two studies.[20]

This time, we find that our results are almost identical to those of Bowers. While 46% of our students, one of whose parents have some college education, cheat, 47% and 45% of the students in Bowers' study with

TABLE IV.7

CHEATING BY PARENTAL EDUCATION

(A)

BOWERS' DATA

Per Cent Cheated			Per Cent Cheated		
Father's Education			Mother's Education		
College Education	Non-College Education	Per Cent Difference	College Education	Non-College Education	Per Cent Difference
47% (2,778)	51% (2,583)	+4%	45% (2,468)	53% (2,872)	+8%

(B)

HILL'S DATA

Per Cent Cheated		
Parental Education		
Some College Education	Neither College Education	Per Cent Difference
46% (187)	53% (241)	+7%

college-educated fathers or mothers cheat. And only 53% of our students from "non-college" families cheat. Thus parental education is a weaker determinant of cheating than is family income for high school students. Since income is more strongly related to cheating than parental education, we will use the former as our measure of social class throughout the remainder of this analysis. (It should also be noted that Bowers found that father's occupation was also not strongly related to cheating.)[21]

Sex and Cheating

Since girls tend to be conformists more often than boys, we would expect them to cheat less than boys. Bowers found this to be the case among college students, and Table IV.8 indicates that we have obtained similar results among the high school students.[22]

TABLE IV.8

CHEATING BY SEX

Bowers' Data		Hill's Data	
Sex	Cheating	Sex	Cheating
Male	54% (2,810)	Male	55% (285)
Female	43% (2,568)	Female	46% (221)
Per Cent Difference	-12%	Per Cent Difference	-9%

Bowers obtained a difference of 12% in the cheating rate between the sexes and we a difference of 9%. Also, the rate of cheating of boys attending college (54%) is almost identical to the cheating rate of high school boys (55%). However, there appears to be a tendency for girls attending high school to cheat more often (46%) than college girls (43%).

Since we have found income and sex to be related to both role type and rates of cheating, a number of questions become relevant. Is the relationship between role types and cheating spurious? Could it be that once either income or sex is controlled for, role type no longer determines the cheating rate? In short, it might be possible to argue that whether one cheats depends not on one's role type, but upon one's sex or family income.

Let us first examine Table IV.9 to determine whether income does reduce the effect of role type on cheating.

TABLE IV.9

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND FAMILY INCOME

Family Income	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Type				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
High ($15,000+)	24% (37)	40% (5)	55% (22)	42% (12)	+18%
Medium ($6-14,000)	44 (64)	53 (15)	64 (74)	67 (36)	+23%
Low (Under $6,000)	51 (35)	50 (10)	54 (39)	60 (15)	+9%
Per Cent Difference	+27%	+10%	-1%	+18%	

Among both "high" and "medium" income students the effect of role type on cheating remains substantially as it was originally. Only 24% of the high income students who are conformists cheat, but almost twice as many (42%) of them cheat when they are retreatists. Role type has the least effect (9%) on cheating by low income students; they tend to exhibit high rates of cheating regardless of their role adaptation. On the other hand, the effect of income on cheating by innovators and ritualists is sharply reduced by role type. Only a 1% difference exists between the rate of cheating by "high" income students and that of "low" income students who are innovators; at the same time, a 10% difference exists between these categories for ritualists. Income has the greatest effect upon cheating by conformists (27%) and retreatists (18%). The "high" income innovators, it should be noted, have a higher cheating rate (55%) than the "high" income retreatists (42%). But the middle and low income innovators have lower cheating rates than middle and lower income retreatists, respectively. Thus this is the first of many specifications that will indicate higher cheating rates among innovators than retreatists.

It is very important to note that for the three deviant adaptations (i.e., the ritualists, the innovators, and retreatists), the highest rates of cheating are found among the middle, not the low income students. Slightly more than half (54%) of the low income innovators cheat, but 64% of the middle income innovators cheat. Also, among the retreatists, the medium income students have a higher cheating rate (67%) than that of those with low incomes (60%). So, once again, our data seems to indicate that the relationship between social class (as measured by income) and deviance (as measured by cheating behavior) is curvilinear. Now that we have seen that both income and role type have strong independent effects on cheating, let us consider the effect of sex on the relationship between role type and cheating, as described in Table IV.10.

TABLE IV.10

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND SEX

Sex	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Type				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Male	40% (78)	33% (15)	67% (126)	62% (55)	+22%
Female	38 (96)	60 (20)	44 (63)	63 (40)	+25%
Per Cent Difference	-2%	+27%	-23%	+1%	

Sex does not weaken the original relationship between role type and cheating at all. As a matter of fact, role type drastically reduces the effect of sex on cheating among two role types -- conformists and retreatists. Although girls tend to be conformists more than boys, there is no difference between the cheating rate (38%) of girl conformists and that (40%) of boy conformists. A similar situation prevails among the retreatists. It is only among the ritualists and innovators that sex makes a difference in cheating rates. Male innovators cheat more frequently than female innovators. But the most unexpected finding is that girls have a higher rate of cheating than boys among the ritualists. Thus role types, as a new sociological variable, reveals a number of situations in which the popular image of girls conforming more than boys is contradicted. For example, female conformists cheat more (38%) than male ritualists (33%); female innovators cheat more (44%) than male conformists (40%); and female retreatists (63%) cheat more than either male conformists (40%) or male ritualists (33%).

In this chapter, we have seen that family income and parental education, I.Q., college aspirations, sex, and race are differentially related to role types. Conformists and ritualists, on the whole, tend to come from higher social class backgrounds, have higher I.Q.'s, have higher college aspirations and expectations than innovators or retreatists. Girls tend to be conformists and boys, innovators. Negroes tend to be ritualists and whites, retreatists.

With respect to cheating, income was found to be a more significant factor than parental education. Sex was also found to be related to cheating behavior, but its effect was much less than that of income. Neither income nor sex appreciably reduced the effect of role type on cheating. In fact, role type sharply specified the original relationships between income and cheating and sex and cheating. Role type, therefore, has been demonstrated to be an important independent variable with regard to predicting rates of deviant behavior.

In the next chapter, we will attempt to locate the places in the social structure where the greatest pressure for cheating behavior exists. We will be interested in determining, for example, whether there is greater pressure on those with high abilities and high grades or on those with low abilities and low grades. Thus we will see whether role type affects cheating rates independent of the student's I.Q. or grades.

Footnotes

1. Ray F. Shurtleff (ed.), *Academic Dishonesty: A Bibliography* (Boston: The Russell B. Stearns Study, Northeastern University, July, 1966).

2. David Gottlieb and Jon Reeves, *Adolescent Behavior in Urban Areas* (New York: Free Press, 1963), pp. 54-59.

3. William J. Bowers, *Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College* (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964).

4. Bernard Barber, *Social Stratification* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1957); Seymour Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959).

5. Bernard Barber, "Social-Class Differences in Educational Life-Chances," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 63, No. 2, November, 1961.

6. *Ibid.*; Lipset and Bendix, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-259.

7. Lipset and Bendix, *Ibid.*, p. 99.

8. See esp. Marshall B. Clinard, *Sociology of Deviant Behavior* (New York: Rinehart, 1957); Gottlieb and Reeves, *op. cit.*

9. Clinard, *Ibid.*, p. 22.

10. Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten, *Society and Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), pp. 91-172; Herbert P. Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes," *Class, Status and Power* (ed.), Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Lipset (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953).

11. Allison Davis, "Acculturation in Schools," *American Minorities*, (ed.) Milton L. Barron (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), pp. 446-450.

12. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 151. rev. ed.

13. Sarane S. Boocock, "Toward a Sociology of Learning," *Sociology of Education*, XXXIX (Winter 1966), pp. 3-4.

14. Elbridge Sibley, "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. VII (June, 1942), pp. 326-330.

15. Merton, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-194.

16. See Dorothy Westby-Gibson, *Social Perspectives on Education* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), pp. 307-308; James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), pp. 252-254.

17. Robert Dentler and Mary G. Warshauer, Big City Dropouts (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1965); Davis, op. cit.; Harry Giles, The Integrated Classroom (New York: Basic Books, 1959).

18. Bowers, op. cit., pp. 211-212.

19. Ibid., p. 213.

20. This process of "collapsing" categories has the effect of reducing original differences; in this case, for both father's and mother's education the percentage differences are reduced by two per cent. For example, the effect of father's education on cheating is now four per cent when it was originally six per cent using expanded categories.

21. Bowers, op. cit., p. 211.

22. Ibid., p. 207.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRESSURES FOR DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

In the previous chapter we showed how students making different role adaptations were distributed in terms of social class, I.Q., college aspirations and expectations, sex, and race. This chapter will attempt to specify the locations in the social structure where certain student types experience the greatest pressures for cheating. Cheating rates will be used as a measure of the degree of cheating pressure since we assume a linear relationship between the two variables: the greater the pressure for cheating, the higher the cheating rate. We will also put to a test the popular assumption that cheating pressure is greater for students with low ability and low grades than for those with high ability and high grades. More specifically, we wish to determine (1) whether high I.Q. students, in fact, cheat less than low I.Q. students; (2) whether cheating rates are higher for students with low grades or high grades; and (3) whether cheating depends more on student role type than I.Q. or grades.

The second major question that we will consider is, "Does cheating pay?" We would like to know whether students who cheat, in fact, get higher grades than those who do not cheat. Can grades be considered as a product of cheating? Or, does cheating result from grades? Thus an attempt will be made to determine the appropriate time sequence between grades and cheating.

A definitive statement on the relationship between pressures for deviance and rates of deviant behavior is presented by Merton:

> But whatever the differential rates of deviant behavior in the several social strata. . .it appears from our analysis that the

> greatest pressures toward deviation are exerted upon the lower strata. . . .
>
> Despite our persisting open-class ideology, advance toward the success-goal is relatively rare and notably difficult for those armed with little formal education and few economic resources. . . . Of those located in the lower reaches of the social structure, the culture makes incompatible demands. . . . The consequence of this structural inconsistency is a high rate of deviant behavior.[1]

Pressures for deviance and, therefore, rates of deviance, are greater for those located at the lower status levels than for those occupying high status positions. Thus Merton asserts an inverse relationship between social class and deviance pressures. He has not, however, made explicit whether this relationship is linear or curvilinear. Most investigators assume a linear negative relation between social class and deviance pressures -- and rates.[2]

Merton also discusses pressures for deviance in terms of differential access to institutional means.[3] Deviance pressures are said to be greater for those with low accessibility to the society's legitimate means than for those with a high degree of access. For the society in general "legitimate means" may refer to "a good education," "an honest job," etc. In school contexts, on the other hand, "access to legitimate means" may refer to a student's ability to obtain high grades. In his analysis, Bowers considered ability as an indicator of legitimate access:

> Cheating is, of course, a manifestation of using illegitimate means to achieve a legitimate end, in this case academic success or at least the avoidance of academic failure. As Merton has pointed out, deviant behavior in pursuit of approved ends is apt to occur when access to legitimate means is restricted. In the case at hand, restricted means translates primarily into a lack of ability to perform well in college courses. We can expect the poor students, those who have difficulty keeping up with the work in their courses, to be the ones most tempted to cheat. This image of the cheater is certainly widespread among college deans and student body presidents. 'Students with bad grades' or 'ppor students' or some equivalent phrase constitutes the most frequent response. . .to a question asking what groups or kinds of students on their campus cheat or plagiarize more often than others. They seem to feel that this is the most common characteristic of students who engage in academic dishonesty on their campuses.[4]

It is clear that this assumption of an inverse relationship between ability and cheating is most widely-accepted by the general public. Even college deans and student body presidents assert that cheating rates are higher among the students with low grades and low I.Q.'s. And, it should be pointed out, this relationship is assumed to be linear, not curvilinear: that is, the highest rates of cheating are assumed to be among those with the lowest grades and I.Q.'s.

Because Bowers had no I.Q. scores for his college students he used college grades as his indicator of student ability. Since he had also recorded the student's high school grade averages, he was able to relate both college and high school grades to cheating.[5] Both of these measures were found to be related to cheating, as indicated in Table V.1. (We have combined Bowers original grade categories in order to facilitate comparison with our findings.)

TABLE V.1[a]

CHEATING BY GRADES: BOWERS' DATA[a]

College Students' College Grades	Cheating	College Students' High School Grades	Cheating
B or higher	41% (1,633)	A or A-	44% (1,677)
B- or C	52 (2,119)	B or B	53 (2,235)
C or lower	55 (1,498)	B- or lower	62% (1,493)
Per Cent Difference	+9%	Per Cent Difference	+10%

[a] Source: William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (NY: Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1964), p. 74, 127.

Looking first at the college grade averages we see that an inverse relationship clearly exists between college grades and cheating rates. More than half (55%) of the students with grades of C or less cheat; at the same time only 41% of those with grades of B or higher cheat. High school grade average of the college students is stronger related to cheating than college grade average. In both cases, however, a linear, not a curvilinear relationship exists between grades and cheating. These findings therefore support the popularly-held image of the cheater: the highest rates of cheating are found among those students having the lowest grades.

Our data as indicated in Table V.2 agrees with Bowers' findings. We have also included the relationship between I.Q. and cheating, since I.Q. is a more direct measure of student ability than grades.

TABLE V.2

CHEATING BY GRADES AND I.Q.: HILL'S DATA

High School Grade Average	Cheating	Student I.Q.	Cheating
A or B	46% (213)	121-164	40% (98)
C	54% (179)	111-120	57% (132)
D or F	55% (106)	100-110	55% (118)
		61-99	50% (127)
Per Cent Difference	+9%	Per Cent Difference	+10%

Among our high school students with grades of B or higher 46%, but among those with grades of D or less 55% cheat. Since the cheating rate of "C" students differed only by one per cent from the cheating rate of "D or F" students, the largest difference in cheating occurs between "A or B" students and students with grades less than B.

I.Q. is not, however, linearly related to rates of cheating; a curvilinear relation exists between I.Q. and cheating. The highest rate of cheating is not found among the students with the lowest I.Q.'s, but among those with above-average I.Q.'s falling in the 111-120 score range. In fact, students with the lowest I.Q.'s (that is, those in the range of 61-99) have the second lowest rate of cheating; even the "average" I.Q. students (i.e., between 100-110) have a higher rate (55%) of cheating. Thus the popular assumption that low ability students have higher cheating rates than high I.Q. students is strongly contradicted by our findings.

This result is another indication that greater pressures for cheating appear to be exerted upon the middle rather than the lower class students. In order to directly test this proposition we will relate grades and I.Q. to social class (as measured by family income) and cheating. Table V.3 presents the relationship between grades, income and cheating.

TABLE V.3

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND GRADES

Grades	Per Cent Cheated			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income			
	High ($15,000+)	Medium ($6-14,000)	Low (Under $6,000)	
A or B	35% (49)	55% (95)	47% (32)	+12%
C	38 (16)	60 (63)	49 (43)	+11
D or F	55 (11)	50 (32)	67 (24)	+11
Per Cent Difference	+20%	-5%	+20%	

First it should be recalled that in the original two-variable relationship, grades were linearly related to cheating. But family income now specifies that relationship: grades are linearly related to cheating among only the "high" and "low" income students. Among the "medium" income students, however, grades are curvilinearly related to cheating: the highest rate of cheating is found among those with "C" grades, not among the "D or F" students. In fact, even the students with grades of B or higher cheat more than the students with grades of D or less. In short, among those students with middle family incomes, the students with D or lower grades have the lowest rate of cheating.

Holding grades constant, we find that among those students receiving grades of C or higher, those from "medium" income families cheat more than those from low income families. For example, 47% of the low income students with grades of B or higher cheat, but 55% of the medium income students with similar grades cheat. A similar result is obtained for the "C" students: 49% of the low income students cheat, but 60% of the medium income students cheat. Thus we have empirical confirmation of the proposition that social class (i.e., income) is curvilinearly related to deviance (i.e., cheating) -- for those with "average" or "above-average" abilities (i.e., grades). The greatest pressures for cheating, therefore, appear to be exerted upon the middle, not the low income strata. Lower income students exhibit their highest rate of cheating (67%) when they have below-average grades of D or less; at the same time, interestingly, this is when the medium income students exhibit their lowest rate of cheating (50%). Although we have used grades as an indicator of a student's ability, we have a more direct measure of ability -- student I.Q. Table V.4 describes how I.Q. and family income are related to cheating.

Family income as a controlling variable reveals three patterns of cheating that were obscured in the original two-variable relationship between I.Q. and cheating. The patterns we find are: (1) that among

TABLE V.4

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND I.Q.

Student I.Q.	Per Cent Cheated			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income			
	High ($15,000+)	Medium ($6-14,000)	Low (Under $6,000)	
121-164	34% (32)	47% (40)	57% (7)	+23%
111-120	43 (28)	58 (57)	56 (18)	+13
100-110	30 (10)	62 (45)	50 (24)	+20
61-99	60 (5)	49 (37)	53 (47)	-7
Per Cent Difference	+26%	+2%	-4%	

the high income students those with below-average I.Q.'s cheat more than those with higher I.Q.'s; (2) that among the medium income students those with average I.Q.'s cheat more than those with below-average or above-average I.Q.'s; and (3) that among the low income students those with above-average I.Q.'s cheat more than those with average or below-average I.Q.'s. Thus in order to discuss the relationship between ability and cheating, one must first specify the income strata that one is referring to. One is no longer justified in assuming that, "in general," I.Q. is inversely related to cheating since that only applies to high income ($15,000 and over) students.

On the other hand, holding I.Q. constant we find that income is linearly related to cheating only among the highest I.Q. category; at the other I.Q. levels the relation between income and cheating is curvilinear. Once again, we find that among the students with "average" abilities (between 100-120) the medium income students have higher cheating rates than the low income students. For example, among the students with I.Q.'s between 100-110, half of those with low income cheat, but 62% of those with medium income cheat. A similar result is obtained on the 111-120 I.Q. level. Thus the greatest pressures for cheating are to be found among the middle income strata ($6-14,000) and among the students with average abilities (falling in either the 100-110 category or in the 111-120 category). Merton's assertion that pressure for deviance is greatest among the strata with least access (or ability) to legitimate means must, therefore, be respecified. With respect to cheating behavior, the greatest pressures for deviance are exerted upon the middle and not the lower strata.

The other place in the social structure where Merton asserts that the greatest pressures for deviance can be found is the situation that involves the largest discrepancy between aspirations and expectations. Individuals who do not realistically expect to achieve their goals by legitimate means are therefore constrained toward illegitimate avenues like cheating. To test this proposition we will use our College Aspirations-Plans Index.

It will be recalled that this Index divided students into four groups: (1) the "High Aspirations-High Plans," those who want to complete four years of college and realistically expect to do so; (2) the "Low Aspirations-High Plans," those who want less than four years of college, but expect to complete college anyway; (3) the "High Aspirations-Low Plans," those who want to complete four years of college, but do not realistically expect to go that far; and (4) the "Low Aspirations-Low Plans," those who want only some college or less and expect to go that far. The third group of students, "the High Aspirations-Low Plans," most closely approximate Merton's anomic situation of discrepant goals and expectations. In order for Merton's hypothesis to be supported, this category should have the highest rate of cheating among the four groupings. Since a measure of ability must be included in order to detect latent pressures for deviance, we will run this Index by cheating and grades.

TABLE V.5

CHEATING BY GRADES AND ASPIRATIONS-PLANS INDEX

Student Grades	Per Cent Cheated			
	College Aspirations-Plans Index			
	High Aspirations-High Plans	Low Aspirations-High Plans	High Aspirations-Low Plans	Low Aspirations-Low Plans
A or B	46% (167)	a (2)	53% (15)	46% (26)
C	54 (68)	a (3)	57 (21)	56 (81)
D or F	61 (23)	a (2)	56 (16)	53 (62)
Per Cent Difference	+15%	a	+3%	+7%

[a] Because of the small base figures we have not recorded percentages.

Holding grades constant, we find in Table V.5 that among the students with grades of C or higher, the "High Aspirations-Low Plans" group does exhibit the highest cheating rates. Among the students with grades of B or higher, for example, 46% of the "Low Aspirations-Low Plans" group cheat, but 53% of the "High Aspirations-Low Plans" group cheat. In fact, at every grade level, the "High Aspirations-Low Plans" students cheat more than the "Low Aspirations-Low Plans" students.

Therefore, we conclude that our data strongly supports this hypothesis of Merton's: the greatest pressures for deviance (i.e., cheating) are found to occur among those groups having the greatest discrepancy between (college) aspirations and realistic expectations.

Role Types and Deviance Pressures

Now that we have located the pressures for deviance in terms of social class and ability levels, we will now attempt to specify the role type upon which the greatest pressures for cheating are exerted. Since the two-variable relationship between role type and cheating indicated that retreatists had the highest cheating rates, it might be assumed that they also bear the greatest pressures for deviance. But we are not justified in making this assumption until we have at least controlled for student grades and I.Q. If when we control for grades, for example, retreatists continue to exhibit the highest cheating rates, then we may conclude that they also experience the greatest pressures. The data in Table V.6 indicates, however, that this is not the case.

TABLE V.6

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND GRADES

Student Grades	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
A or B	37% (101)	41% (17)	58% (69)	46% (22)	+9%
C	39 (44)	50 (12)	60 (79)	69 (39)	+30%
D or F	44 (27)	67 (6)	58 (38)	65 (31)	+21%
Per Cent Difference	+7%	+26%	0%	+19%	

Among those students with grades of B or higher, innovators have a higher cheating rate (58%) than retreatists (46%). And, among the students with grades of D or less, the ritualists have a higher cheating rate (67%) than the retreatists (65%). But among the "C" students, the retreatists exhibit the highest rate of cheating (69%). However, among the students with the highest grades, the innovators appear to experience the greatest pressures for cheating. In addition, holding role type constant, we note that innovators are the only role type whose cheating rate is not affected by grade level. Innovators continue to exhibit high rates of cheating regardless of their grades. This indicates that factors other than grades -- like parental pressure, for example -- are responsible for the high cheating rates exhibited by innovators. Since the cheating behavior on the part of the other three role types can be partly explained on the basis of grades, we must conclude that the greatest pressures for deviance are exerted upon innovators. Retreatists can be considered to bear the next greatest pressures for deviance. Now let us examine Table V.7 to see whether similar findings result when we substitute I.Q. for grades.

TABLE V.7

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPES AND I.Q.

Student I.Q.	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
121-164	28% (40)	39% (13)	58% (31)	31% (13)	+3%
111-120	45 (49)	50 (6)	63 (46)	67 (27)	+22%
100-110	37 (30)	57 (7)	58 (45)	71 (34)	+34%
61-99	43 (42)	57 (7)	56 (57)	60 (15)	+17%
Per Cemt Difference	+15%	+18%	-2%	+29%	

Among the students falling into the highest I.Q. bracket we find, as we did with grades, that innovators have the highest rate of cheating. Among the students with I.Q.'s between 121-164 about one-third (31%) of the retreatists cheat, but 58% of the innovators cheat. On the other hand, among the students with lower I.Q.'s retreatists cheat more often than innovators with similar I.Q.'s.

Holding role type constant we find, also as we did with grades, that I.Q. has no effect on cheating by innovators; I.Q. does, however, determine the rates of cheating for the remaining three role types. Innovators persist in exhibiting high rates of cheating no matter what their I.Q.'s. Consequently, I.Q., like grades, fails to account for the high cheating rates among innovators; its explanation must be sought in terms of latent pressures from significant role-partners, such as the family and the peer group.

Throughout this analysis of the pressures for deviant behavior, we have employed "objective" measures like actual grades and actual I.Q. to locate students in different pressure climates. The final measure that we will use to aid us in detecting the places with the greatest cheating pressures is "subjective." The students were asked, "Generally, what is the lowest mark that you would really be satisfied with?" One might expect that students who were satisfied with low grades would be less likely to cheat than those students who were satisfied only with high grades. In other words, we hypothesize a positive relationship between lowest satisfactory grade and cheating: the higher the grade that one would be satisfied with, the greater the pressures for cheating -- and the higher the cheating rates.

The data in Table V.8 indicate that a positive relationship between lowest satisfactory grade and cheating holds only among the innovators; 56% of

TABLE V.8

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND LOWEST SATISFACTORY GRADE

Lowest Grade Satisfied With	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
B or higher	31% (71)	50% (12)	63% (43)	43% (12)	+11%
C	43 (87)	53 (17)	59 (118)	68 (54)	+25%
D	50 (14)	40 (5)	56 (25)	63 (27)	+13%
Per Cent Difference	+19%	-10%	-7%	+21%	

the students who would be satisfied with a "D" grade cheat, but 63% of those who would only be satisfied with a B or higher cheat. A trend toward a positive relationship is apparent among the ritualists. But for conformists and retreatists the relations are reversed. Among conformists, the cheating rate increases the lower the grade one is satisfied with: one-third of the students who would be satisfied with a grade of B or higher cheat, but one-half of the conformists who would be satisfied with a minimum grade of D cheat. Thus we can now more clearly specify the locations of greatest pressure among the role types: the pressure for cheating among innovators and ritualists increases the higher the grade they would be satisfied with; and the pressure for cheating among conformists and retreatists increase the lower the grade they would be satisfied with. Although lowest satisfactory grade has more of an effect on cheating by innovators than I.Q. or grades, its effect on innovators is less than it is for the other role types.

Functions of Cheating

We have specified various places in the social structure where the greatest pressures for cheating can be found. Now we would like to determine if this cheating "pays off." Do students' grades increase as the frequency of cheating increases? Is grade a product of cheating or is it vice versa?

Most discussions of the relationship between grades and cheating assume the latter to be prior. Bowers expresses this view as follows:

> Moreover, the honest student suffers along with the dishonest one. To the extent that academic dishonesty prevails and goes undetected, students will receive grades for work they have not done -- rewards to which they are not entitled. . . .
>
> For the honest student, this presents a demoralizing situation. He will be aware that many of his peers have cheated. . . . He will see others bettering their grades by cheating and will himself feel temptations and pressures to cheat.[6]

Whether individual students obtained high grades on particular examinations as a result of cheating is not our concern; we are interested in knowing whether grades increase or decrease as the frequency of cheating increases. In Table V.9 we have related grades to frequency of cheating.

TABLE V.9

GRADES BY FREQUENCY OF CHEATING

Per Cent A or B					
Frequency of Cheating					
Never Cheated	Cheated Once	A Few Times	Several	Often	Per Cent Difference
47% (245)	44% (92)	39% (139)	25% (16)	0% (6)	-47%

We find that a linear relationship between frequency of cheating and grades does exists, but it is a negative one: the more frequently cheating is practiced, the lower the student's grades. This places us in the untenable position of arguing that students lower -- not raise -- their grades by cheating. Actually these findings indicate that grades should be considered to be prior to cheating. In other words, cheating rates can be explained in terms of grades, but not vice versa.

Could it be, however, that when role type is introduced into this relationship, we will find that cheating does "pay off" for certain role adaptations? Do innovators who cheat, for example, get higher grades than those who do not cheat?

TABLE V.10

GRADES BY CHEATING AND ROLE TYPE

Cheating	Per A or B				
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Marginals
Never Cheated	60% (106)	56% (18)	38% (77)	34% (35)	49% (236)
Cheated	56 (66)	41 (17)	37 (109)	18 (57)	38 (249)
Per Cent Difference	-4%	-15%	-1%	-16%	-11%

Within each role type the data in Table V.10 reveals that the grades of the "noncheaters" are higher than those of the cheaters. The one per cent difference in grades among the innovators indicates, however, that cheating may very well be "profitable" for them. At any rate, innovators who cheat are not hurt by it. But among both ritualists and retreatists, the grades of the cheaters are much lower than those of the noncheaters. For example, 18% of the retreatists who cheat have grades of B or higher, but 34% of the non-cheating retreatists have similar grades. And while 41% of the ritualists who cheat have B or higher grades, 56% of the noncheating ritualists have B or higher grades.

On the whole, as the marginals indicate, noncheaters obtain higher grades than cheaters. But if a student is either an innovator or conformist, whether he cheats or not will have little effect upon his grades; however, if he is either a ritualist or retreatist it does not "pay" for him to cheat. Consequently, we see that for certain role types cheating can be quite "functional."

In this chapter, we have found the greatest pressures for cheating to be among (1) middle-income students, (2) students with average and above-average I.Q.'s, (3) students with average and below-average grades, (4) students with high aspirations and low expectations, and (5) innovators and retreatists, in that order. Grades were also found not to be a product of cheating, but cheating a result of grades. In general, cheating did not pay off in terms of higher grades.

This chapter and the preceding one examined the effect of individual traits upon deviance and role types. In the next chapter, we will observe the effect of group or collectivity traits upon these variables.

Footnotes

1. Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (December, 1959) pp. 836-45; Natalie Rogoff, "Local Social Structure and Educational Selection," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Flood, and C. Arnold Anderson (eds.) *Education, Economy, and Society*, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 242-243.

2. Theodore M. Newcomb, "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study," *Readings in Social Psychology* (ed.) G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley, (New York: Holt, 1952), pp. 420-30.

3. James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society*, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe: 1961), pp. 252-54.

4. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., *The Academic Mind* (New York Free Press, 1958), esp. Chapter 10.

5. Seymour Lipset, Martin Trow and James S. Coleman, *Union Democracy*, (New York: Doubleday and Anchor, 1956)

6. Peter M. Blau, "Structural Effects," *American Sociological Review*, XXV, (April, 1960), pp. 178-93.

7. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relations Between Individual and Collective Properties," *Complex Organizations*, (ed.) Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 422-40.

8. William H. Sewell and J. Michael Armer, "Neighborhood Context and College Plans," *American Sociological Review*, XXXI (April, 1966), pp. 159-168.

9. Seymour Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), p. 204, 206.

10. *Ibid*., p. 219-220.

11. Emile Durkheim, *Suicide* (1897), trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957)

12. Marshall B. Clinard, *Sociology of Deviant Behavior* (New York: Rinehart, 1957); Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, *Society and Education*, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), pp. 349-64.

13. Blau, *Op*. *cit*.

14. Edwin M. Lemert, "Social Structure, Social Control, and Deviation," *Anomie and Deviant Behavior*, (ed.) Marshall Clinard (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 73-9.

15. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 153-56.

16. Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), pp. 836-45.

17. Bowers, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-50.

18. Since our variable is a dichotomy, while Bowers is a trichotomy, it is to be expected that our measure would be somewhat weaker. If, however, Bowers' "strong" and "moderate" categories were combined, the percentage difference that results would almost be identical to ours.

CHAPTER SIX

SOURCES OF ROLE TYPES AND DEVIANCE: SOCIAL CONTEXT

We showed in the preceding chapter that such individual attributes as social class, I.Q., grades, sex, college aspirations, expectations, and race were differentially related to role types and rates of deviant behavior. We shall investigate the extent to which the student's social environment affects the kind of role adaptations he makes and his cheating behavior. What effect does community size, for example, have upon role adaptations and deviance? Are students living in rural areas more likely to be conformists than those living in urban settings? Is the cheating rate higher in the city or the suburbs?

Like many recent studies in this field we will employ a measure of the community social class context.[1] In addition, an environmental variable that is rarely used in these studies will be part of this analysis -- classroom context. Classroom context will be shown to be a more influential determinant of student role behavior than community or high school context, which are the measures that are traditionally used in this kind of analysis.

Another social context variable that will be used by us is what is most often referred to as the "value climate." It refers to contexts in which group norms or values are considered to be the main determinants of role behavior or attitudes. In the 1942 Bennington Study, for example, Newcomb found that the liberal attitudes of the college changed the conservatism of many freshmen girls to nonconservatism by the time they were seniors.[2] In his study of adolescent subcultures, Coleman distinguishes his ten high schools on the basis of their value-orientation to academic goals.[3]

Since students will be characterized on the basis of group properties in this chapter, our approach can be termed a "contextual analysis." This mode of analysis has been employed by numerous investigators. In The Academic Mind, for example, the personal permissiveness of social science professors was shown to be affected by the permissiveness of their college climates.[4] Lipset characterized printers in terms of the size of their union shop.[5] And, Blau has made various styles of this approach explicit in his discussion of "structural effects."[6] Lazarsfeld and Menzel classify the various kinds of individual and group properties that can be part of a contextual analysis; we will adopt their terminology when referring to these variables in this study.[7]

For the most part, the collectivity variables that will be used in our analysis are "analytical"; that is, they will be aggregated or summed up from smaller units. This will be so particularly for our classroom context variables. After ranking the twenty-two classroom units in terms of the proportion of students exhibiting a particular characteristic, the units will be divided into "high" and "low" on that dimension. Let us use as an example the classroom context that we refer to as "classroom adaptations," which will serve as our indicator of the degree of egoism present in various classrooms. Since the individual trait of role type serves as the psychological component of egoism, the classroom will be characterized as "conformist-oriented" (i.e., low egoism) and "deviant-oriented" (or high egoism) on the basis of whether an above-the-mean or below-the-mean proportion of students who are deviant role types are located there.

Thus social context has been demonstrated to be an important sociological variable in the explanation of individual and group attitudes and behavior. Sewell and Armer have noted in this connection:

> More recently, the social environments or contexts in which individuals live have been examined for their bearing on educational aspirations. Such specific social context variables as rural-urban residence, peer group associations, the socioeconomic composition of the high schools, and the socioeconomic composition of the community or neighborhood have been suggested by a number of investigators.[8]

Although Sewell and Armer include "peer group associations" as a social context variable, we will defer consideration of this variable until the next chapter. This variable is so important a determinant of student behavior that we have devoted separate chapters to examine it.

Community Size

Community size will be the first environmental variable that we will discuss. A number of studies have indicated that educational opportunities are positively related to community size. Analyses of social mobility, as Lipset and Bendix point out, have found:

> . . . that the larger a man's community of orientation (the community in which he spent his teens), the higher the status of the job he holds is likely to be. . . . Then, we find that size of community of orientation is most closely related to occupational position within the ranks of industry and large-scale organization. The smaller the community of orientation the less likely a lower-class individual is to be upwardly mobile within bureaucratic structures. . . .
>
> It is clear. . .that working-class youth growing up in large cities are much more likely to reach high occupational status than those coming from smaller communities.[9]

They go on to note that community size has a greater effect upon the educational opportunities available to lower-class than middle-class youth:

> . . . lower-class individuals growing up in a large city are more likely to secure more education than their counterparts in smaller communities. . . . Metropolitan lower-class youth also benefit from the fact that the teaching staffs in their high schools are usually better paid and trained than those in smaller communities, and hence are more likely to give their students greater incentive to attend college. Evidence that these assumptions are valid is

contained in the Survey Research Data which show that 18 per cent of the sons of manual workers reared in big cities have some college education, compared with 12.5 per cent for those who grew up in small towns.[10]

Therefore, we should expect to find a higher proportion of the academically-oriented adaptations, the conformists and ritualists, distributed in the larger than the smaller communities.

TABLE VI.1

ROLE TYPE BY COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Student Role Type				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
City (100,000+)[a]	47%	12%	29%	12%	(149)
Suburbs (18-30,000)	35	7	38	21	(196)
Small Towns (4-6,000)	25	2	53	21	(101)
Rural (2,500)	25	4	40	31	(48)
Per Cent Difference	-22%	-8%	+11%	+19%	

[a] The numbers in parentheses refer to the estimated 1960 populations of the communities.

The data in Table VI.1 fully supports our expectations. That the percentage differences become positive as one moves from conformists to retreatists indicates that innovators and retreatists tend to come from small towns and rural communities, but the conformists and ritualists come from the suburbs and cities. While only one-fourth of those living in rural areas are conformists, almost one-half (47%) of those living in cities are conformists. Similarly, only 12% of those living in cities are retreatists, but almost one-third of those (31%) living in rural communities are retreatists. Thus role type is inversely related to community size: the larger the community the smaller the proportion of students making deviant adaptations.

Community-High School Class Context

Now that we have seen that the distribution of role types varies according to the size of the community, let us see whether the social class composition of the community has a similar effect. Since we saw in chapter V that conformists tend to come from high SES families, we would expect for them to also come from high SES communities.

As all eight of the communities in our sample have only one high school, the social class composition of the school may be assumed to reflect that of the community. Although this assumption is not necessarily valid, we will make it in order to permit us to use a single measure of community and high school SES. Because we do not have a representative sample of students from each high school -- we only have two tenth grade classes -- we cannot reliably generalize to the entire high school population. Nevertheless, since the relation of this variable to role types has important implications for future research in this area we will introduce this variable into our analysis. This, however, will be the only time in our study that this measure will be used.

The eight communities (or high schools) were ranked on the proportion of its students whose fathers held "high white-collar" positions (which included managerial, semi-professionals, junior executives, medium size entrepreneurs, etc.). Since the mean proportion was 35%, communities with "higher" proportions were classified as "high SES" communities, while those with proportions less than 35% were classified as "low SES" communities (or high schools). Since we have for operational purposes equated the high school class context with the community class context, we refer to this variable as

"Community-High School Context." In Table VI.2 we see how it is related to role type.

TALLE VI.2

ROLE TYPE BY COMMUNITY-HIGH SCHOOL SES

Community-High School SES	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	N
High SES	33%	6%	41%	20%	(195)
Low SES	37	8	37	18	(299)
Per Cent Difference	+4%	+2%	-4%	-2%	

To our surprise community-High School SES is positively related to role type: the higher the SES of the community, the larger the proportion of students making deviant adaptations. Thus, a higher proportion (37%) of conformists is to be found in the low SES than the high SES context. Since the percentage differences are so small (none is greater than 4%), we cannot attribute much statistical significance to them. Nevertheless, the figures do indicate a trend toward deviant adaptations in high community class contexts. Thus it could be that the upper-middle class conformists come from low SES communities. But studies with representative samples of the community or the high school are needed to test the validity of this finding.

We do, however, have a context for which we have a representative sample -- classroom context. (In fact, our sample of the classroom is really a census since all of the students in each classroom were interviewed.) The twenty-two classroom units were ranked also on the proportion of students whose fathers hold high white-collar occupations. And the same cutting point of 35% was used to distinguish the "high" SES classroom units from the "low" SES units.

Table VI.3 reveals that the relationship between classroom SES and role type is in the expected direction: the proportion of students making deviant adaptations decreases with an increase in the SES composition of the classroom.

TABLE VI.3

ROLE TYPE BY CLASSROOM SES

Classroom SES	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
High SES	43%	9%	29%	19%	(215)
Low SES	29	5	46	20	(279)
Per Cent Difference	-14%	-4%	+17%	+1%	

While ritualists and retreatists are just as likely to come from a high SES classroom as well as a low SES one, conformists are more likely to come from high SES classroom contexts and innovators from low SES classroom contexts. In short, classroom context does not determine whether a student will become a ritualist or retreatist, but it can affect student adaptations to conformity and innovation.

At any rate, the point that we wish to emphasize is that classroom SES is a more powerful determinant of student role type than community or high school SES. This finding gains added importance because investigators concerned with the effect of social context on students attitudes or behavior go no lower than the community or high school levels. Measures of classroom context, for the most part, have been neglected.

So far, we have seen that role type is inversely related to community size and classroom class context. But it was shown to be positively related to the SES climate of the community (or the high school). Now we shall see how these factors are related to rates of cheating behavior.

Curiously, while the data suggests that opportunities for achievement are greater in urban than rural communities, the deviance rates also tend to be greater in urban settings. Durkheim, for example, found suicide rates to be much lower in rural than urban areas.[11] Rates of crime, delinquency, and school dropout are usually higher in urban than rural areas.[12] We expect, therefore, rates of cheating behavior to be higher in the larger communities.

TABLE VI.4

CHEATING BY COMMUNITY SIZE

Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
Community Size				
Rural	Small Towns	Suburbs	City	
44% (48)	60% (101)	59% (201)	38% (156)	-6%

Contrary to our expectations, the data in Table VI.4 indicate that the city -- not the rural community -- has the lowest rate of cheating; although the rural area does have the second lowest rate. In fact, a curvilinear relationship exists between community size and cheating; the small town and suburb have the highest rates of cheating. This suggests that greater pressure for cheating may be exerted upon students from small towns and suburbs than upon those from cities and rural areas.

Now we will examine the relationship between social class context and deviance. The ecological studies of crime and delinquency have found these rates to be higher in lower class than in middle or upper class environment. In Table VI.5 we have related cheating to community-high school SES and also to classroom SES.

TABLE VI.5

CHEATING BY COMMUNITY-HIGH SCHOOL SES, CLASSROOM SES

Community-High School SES	Cheating	Classroom SES	Cheating
High SES	54% (197)	High SES	49% (217)
Low SES	49 (309)	Low SES	53 (289)
Per Cent Difference	-5%	Per Cent Difference	+4%

Community-high school SES is positively related to cheating, while classroom SES is negatively related to cheating. About half (49%) of the students in low SES communities cheat, while 54% of those living in high SES communities cheat. These percentages, however, are reversed on the classroom level: half (49%) of the students in high SES classrooms cheat, while 53% of those in low SES classrooms cheat. So we see that community SES and classroom SES have "inverse" effects upon cheating rates.

High School Curriculum

It is still possible to argue, however, that it is not classroom SES that is inversely related to cheating, but classroom track or curriculum. Since high proportions of students in high SES classrooms are enrolled in college-preparatory programs, it could be that their college-orientation motivates them to get good grades without cheating. Thus the lower cheating rates in high SES classrooms could be explained in terms of a college-prep curriculum context.

TABLE VI.6

GRADES AND CHEATING BY HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

High School Curriculum	Per Cent A or B Grades	High School Curriculum	Per Cent Cheated
College Preparatory	58% (318)	College Preparatory	50% (321)
Commercial	18 (71)	Commercial	50 (72)
General	17 (62)	General	53 (71)
Vocational	6 (35)	Vocational	54 (35)
Per Cent Difference	-52%	Per Cent Difference	-4%

The relationship between curriculum and grades as shown in Table VI.6 indicates that course of work is a very important determinant of a student's grades. For only 6% of the students enrolled in vocational programs have grades of B or higher, but 58% of the students enrolled in college-prep courses have grades of B or higher. But while curriculum is strongly related to grades, it has almost no effect upon rates of cheating. About half of the college-prep students cheat, but only 4% more cheat of those enrolled in a vocational curriculum. Thus high school curriculum cannot be considered as an important source of cheating behavior.

Thus far, cheating was shown to be: (1) curvilinearly related to community size, (2) positively related to community-high school SES, (3) negatively related to classroom SES, and (4) high school curriculum. Of these four factors, community size had the strongest affect on cheating. There was, it will be recalled, a 21% difference in the cheating rate between the suburbs and the city. Community size and classroom SES were also shown to be inversely related to role type. We shall now observe whether role type has any independent effects upon cheating when one controls for community size, and classroom SES contexts.

In the case of community size, it could be argued that it is not role type, but community type that accounts for various rates of cheating by different students.

TABLE VI.7

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
City	31% (70)	50% (18)	49% (43)	39% (18)	+8%
Suburbs	38 (68)	62 (13)	69 (74)	71% (41)	+33%
Small Towns	60 (25)	0 (2)	64 (53)	57 (21)	-3%
Rural	36 (11)	0 (2)	32 (19)	73 (15)	+37%
Per Cent Difference	+5%	+12%[a]	-17%	+34%	

[a] This is a city-suburb difference since so few ritualists lived in the small towns and rural area.

On the whole, the data in Table VI.7 show that role type is a more powerful determinant of cheating than community size. For example, while 36% of the conformists from rural areas cheat, more than twice as many (73%) of its retreatists cheat. Role type, however, has almost no effect on the cheating behavior of students from small towns -- this is one of the rare instances in which the effect of role type on cheating has been drastically reduced. A consistently high rate of cheating is maintained regardless of whether the student is a conformist (60%) or a retreatist (57%). In the city, on the other hand, the biggest difference in cheating is not between the conformists and retreatists, but between the conformists and ritualists. In the suburbs, all three deviant role types exhibit high rates of cheating.

These findings should make investigators who might wish to replicate some of our analysis exercise great caution in the selection of the communities for their sample. If, for example, a researcher draws his sample of students from only small towns, he may very well find that role type is not a very important determinant of cheating. On the other hand, a researcher with a sample of students from either a city, suburb, or rural area might find role type to be very important in affecting cheating behavior. The contradictory findings of the two researchers could then be explained on the basis of the different types of community from which they drew their samples. Fortunately, the design of this study allows us to observe relationships between communities, as well as within them.

Since we will go into the reasons why role type has only a slight effect upon cheating in small towns in succeeding chapters, we will not dwell on this issue at this time. But we can provide some clues to the direction that our examination will take. Just as very few variables affected the cheating rate of innovators, we will conceive of small towns as the collectivity equivalent of innovators. Small towns, in short, are "innovating" towns; the greatest pressures for deviant (i.e., cheating) behavior can be found there. And the extent of involvement in various peer group activities is a primary factor that contributes to the great deviance pressures prevailing there. However, we will save this for the next chapter.

Classroom SES context was found to be inversely related to both role type and cheating. Table VI.8 indicates how it affects the relationship between these variables.

TABLE VI.8

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND CLASSROOM SES

Classroom SES	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
High SES	34% (93)	50% (20)	65% (62)	58% (40)	+24%
Low SES	43 (81)	47 (15)	57 (127)	66 (55)	+23%
Per Cent Difference	+9%	-3%	-8%	+8%	

Classroom SES does not alter the original relationship between role type and cheating; in fact, role type strengthens the impact of classroom SES on cheating. The cheating rates of conformists and retreatists are negatively related to classroom SES: as the SES level decreases the rates of cheating among both of these types increase. Among innovators, however, classroom SES is positively related to cheating. While 57% of the innovators in low SES classrooms cheat, 65% of them in high SES classrooms cheat. Classroom SES has a similar, but much weaker, effect on cheating among ritualists. It should also be pointed out that high classroom SES provides another situation in which innovators cheat more often than retreatists.

This differential effect of classroom SES on the role types indicates that there is greater pressure for cheating among the ritualists and innovators in high SES classrooms than among the conformists and retreatists.

Classroom Adaptations

Our next contextual variable, "classroom adaptations," can be considered as a measure of the degree of egoism prevailing in classroom contexts. Or, in terms of Merton's terminology, it is an indicator of anomie on the level of the collectivity. Individual role type is used throughout this analysis as the psychological component of egoism (that is, equivalent to Merton's concept of "anomia"). We have classified each of the twenty-two classroom units as "conformist-oriented" or "deviant-oriented" depending on whether the proportion of students in the class making the conformist adaptation was above or below the mean of 35%, respectively.

This aggregated measure of classroom adaptations allows us to come to terms with one of the most important questions in Merton's theory of anomie, "Is the rate of deviant behavior a result of individual or group adaptations?" In other words, do individuals exhibit deviant behavior because of their own role adaptation or because of the large number of individuals in their immediate environment who have made deviant adaptations? These are the kinds of questions that Blau says must be asked in order to distinguish "structural" group effects from "individual" effects.[13] A number of investigators like Lemert argue that it is collective, not individual adaptations that are the main sources of deviance.[14]

TABLE VI.9

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND CLASSROOM ADAPTATIONS

Classroom Adaptations	Per Cent Cheated				
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Marginals
Conformist-Oriented	32% (91)	45% (20)	53% (40)	32% (25)	38% (176)
Deviant-Oriented	46 (83)	53 (15)	61 (149)	73 (70)	59 (317)
Per Cent Difference	+14%	+8%	+8%	+41%	+21%

The marginals in Table VI.9 indicate, as might be expected, that a strong relationship exists between classroom adaptations and cheating: while 38% of the students in "conformist-oriented" classrooms cheat, 59% of those in "deviant-oriented" classrooms cheat. When role type is introduced, this relationship is specified for certain role types. Its impact upon cheating rates of retreatists is doubled (to 41%); however, it affects cheating among the other three role types much less. Nevertheless, among every role type, an increase in the proportion of deviant adaptations in the classroom context results in an increase in the amount of cheating in that context. Although the effect of role type on cheating has been reduced slightly in the "conformist-oriented" classrooms, it is evident that individual and group adaptations have strong <ins>independent</ins> effects on deviant behavior. Thus in order to account for rates of deviant behavior one must assess the effect of both group and individual orientations. In short, a conformist placed in a deviant environment will cheat more than if located in a conformist context. Similarly with the retreatists: they exhibit the same rates of cheating (32%) as conformists who are also located in a conformist-oriented context.

On the whole, however, individual adaptations tend to have a greater impact upon deviance than group adaptations.

Climate of Peer Disapproval

Our final contextual variable, the "climate of peer disapproval" in a classroom, was derived from Bower's analysis.[15] The students in our sample were asked to indicate how strongly their "closest friend" would disapprove of their cheating if they knew about it. The twenty-two classrooms were ranked according to the per cent of students in each who responded "very" and "fairly" strong to the question. Classes with proportions over the mean per cent of 36% were classified "high" peer disapproval units and those with proportions below 36% were classified as "low" peer disapproval units. Since this aggregated contextual variable is based upon the students perceptions of how he feels his peers would respond, this measure should be properly considered as a Perceived Peer Disapproval Index or as a "perceived" value or normative climate.

Although it is a perceived measure, this variable "peer disapproval climate" will constitute our most direct measure of student norms toward cheating. In the past many investigators have attempted to infer peer group norms from community or high school SES contexts.[16] We will demonstrate that perceived normative climate has a greater effect on deviant behavior than social class climate.

Ideally, actual normative climate of the students should be employed, but we failed to include an item that asked the student about his own norms toward cheating. However, this may not have been a serious oversight. For Bowers, who did include such an item in his study, found that perceived peer disapproval was a more powerful determinant of cheating than the student's own personal disapproval of cheating.[17]

In Table VI.10 we compare Bowers' results with our own data. It should be remembered that Bower's climate of peer disapproval refers to *college* climates, while ours refer to classroom climates in high schools.

TABLE VI.10

CHEATING BY CLIMATE OF PEER DISAPPROVAL

BOWERS' DATA (p. 154)[a]		HILL'S DATA	
College Climate of Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheating	Classroom Climate of Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheating
Very Strong, Fairly Strong	31% (1,604)	High Disapproval	44% (253)
Moderate	50 (2,165)	Low Disapproval	60 (240)
Fairly, Very Weak	64 (1,653)		
Per Cent Difference	+33%	Per Cent Difference	+16%

[a] Source: William J. Bowers, *Student Dishonesty*, op.cit., p.154.

In Bowers' data, the cheating rate among students goes up as the perceived normative disapproval from their peers weakens. While less than one-third of the college students whose friends "fairly" or "very" strongly disapprove of cheating actually cheat, more than twice as many among those with "weak" peer sanctions cheat. With our data we obtain similar results: while 44% of the students in classrooms with high diapproval norms cheat, 60% of those located in low disapproval normative climates cheat.[18]

At any rate, it is evident that classroom climate of peer disapproval is an important source of deviant behavior. The question that we now consider is, "Do role types have independent effects on cheating when climate of peer disapproval is controlled for? Or, does climate of peer disapproval sharply reduce the effect of role type on cheating? Table VI.11 provides the answer.

TABLE VI.11

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND PEER DISAPPROVAL CLIMATE

Classroom Climate of Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
High Disapproval	31% (111)	57% (21)	50% (78)	58% (43)	+27%
Low Disapproval	52 (63)	36 (14)	66 (111)	65 (52)	+13%
Per Cent Difference	+21%	-21%	+16%	+7%	

When simultaneously controlled for, both role type and classroom climate of peer disapproval have strong independent effects on cheating. Conformists, innovators, and retreatists all cheat more frequently in normative contexts in which the perceived peer disapproval is weakest. It is only upon the ritualists' cheating behavior that peer disapproval climate has a curious effect. Instead of the cheating rate going down as the peer disapproval of cheating increased, it went up. A little over one-third of the ritualists in low peer disapproval contexts cheat, but 57% of the ritualists in high disapproval contexts cheat. What is the explanation for this odd finding?

We suspect, but do not have the data to support it, that the peer group climate has an inverse effect upon the ritualists because they have few "close" friends among their class peers. An inspection of sociometric data that are part of the larger N.J. study seems to indicate that ritualists tend to be named disproportionately as "least" popular or tend to have few classmates as close friends. Since these data have not been systematically tabulated yet, we cannot use them in this analysis. However, since we will examine the relation between popularity and deviance in chapter VIII, we will try to provide additional insight to this question there.

Social context has been shown to be an important source of role types and rates of cheating. Community size is inversely related to role type, but curvilinearly related to cheating. Role type has almost no effect on cheating for students from small towns. Classroom adaptations and Classroom Climate of Peer Disapproval both had strong independent effects on cheating behavior. In the next chapter we will attempt to directly assess the impact of the adolescent peer group on deviant behavior.

Footnotes

1. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 144-146.

2. Marshall B. Clinard, Sociology of Deviant Behavior, (New York: Rinehart, 1957); Bernard Lander, Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954); Nye, Short and Olsen, however sharply dissent from this point of view. See F. Ivan Nye, James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olson, "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 63 (January, 1958) pp. 381-389.

3. Merton, Op. cit., p. 131-194.

4. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964) p. 73.

5. Ibid., p. 74, 137.

6. Ibid., p. 2.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOURCES OF ROLE TYPES AND DEVIANCE: PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Thus far in our analysis we have examined the effect of individual and collectivity attributes on rates of cheating behavior. We now turn our attention to the relevance of "interpersonal relations" as a source of deviance. In this and succeeding chapters, the role adaptations and cheating behavior of students will be partly explained in terms of current role theory.[1]

As the student is the "focal" status occupant for this study, his perceptions of the normative expectations of his role partners will be examined. Role-conflict among adolescents is usually conceived as an outgrowth of the conflict between the expectations held by their adult role-partners and those of their age-peers.[2] The conflicting normative expectations of the adolescents' own peers have been largely neglected; this neglect is unfortunate since it is apparent that normative conflicts among adolescents can account for much of their role behavior. In short, the focus should not be placed on the traditional value-conflict between adults and adolescents, but on the conflicting value-orientations among student themselves. Such a focus, we feel, can more adequately account for different rates of conforming and deviant behavior among adolescents than the traditional emphasis.

That the peer group has a stronger impact than the family on much of the behavior and attitudes of adolescents has been confirmed by numerous investigations.[3] But the implication has been that the peer group pulls the student in one direction -- away from academic and intellectual pursuits. This view has gained widespread currency because it is based upon the popular assumption that a high degree of value consensus exists among adolescents. However as Gross observes, normative consensus should be treated as a variable for empirical verification not as a constant.[4] Thus it is fruitful to hypothesize that students are pulled by their peers in at least two directions: toward and away from academic values. The aim of this chapter, therefore, will be (1) to determine the extent to which value dissensus exists among students, and (2) if it does exist, to determine its effect on cheating. An examination of both these questions will be continued into the next chapter dealing with popularity and deviant behavior.

It is clear that this focus on value dissensus among adolescents is in direct conflict with Coleman's thesis of the adolescent subculture.[5] This view holds that a "modal" value orientation exists among adolescents; that this value-orientation ranks "social" or "anti-educational" pursuits more highly than academic or intellectual endeavors, and that this value-orientation sharply conflicts with that of adults. These positions will be explicitly tested in the next chapter. The findings, at that time, will point out the need for drastic respecifications of Coleman's description of the adolescent society.

In this chapter the groundwork will be laid for a test of Coleman's position. First, we will try to determine the norms of adolescents toward academic values. Do they tend to accept or reject the goal of academic success? More important, do students cheat to such a large extent because they do not define cheating as morally wrong? In short, do students morally approve or disapprove of cheating? After considering these questions, we will examine the effect of peer disapproval of cheating on rates of cheating behavior. In the process, we will assess the relative impact of peer disapproval and role types on cheating.

Orientation to Academic Values

In order to determine the attitude of students toward academic values, they were asked to express their feelings regarding a number of questions dealing with educational orientation. We will report the distribution of their responses to three of these questions. The first was, "About how much schooling do you think most young men need these days to get along well in the world?" More than half of the students (54%, in fact) responded either "four years of college" or "graduate school"; those responding "some college" comprised 18% of the students; and the remaining 25% said either "finish high school" or less. Thus we see that 75% of the students felt that the least amount of education that young men should have was "college education."

To the second question, "A person who wants to get ahead today has to do well in school," 83% of the students said that they "strongly agreed" with it, and 14% "somewhat agreed," with 2% "somewhat disagreeing." It is clear that the norm "one should do well in school" is widely held by adolescents.

To the final question, "How important would you say getting good marks in school is to you?" almost three-fourths (73%) of the students said "very important," while 25% responded "somewhat important" and only 2% said that getting good grades was "not important at all" to them. Consequently, the attainment of good grades is a strongly-held value among most students.

The skewness of the responses to these three questions reveals that the overwhelming majority of adolescents internalize the academic norms of the dominant society. Thus their high rate of deviant behavior should not be explained in terms of their not having internalized adult academic norms. This behavior persists despite the fact that they have internalized these norms. The explanation for this deviance should be considered in terms of their perception of the norms of significant role-partners -- their age-peers. However, before examining their perception of disapproval from their peers, it is important to make clear that an orientation to academic values characterizes college students, as well as high school students.

To determine the attitudes of college students toward academic dishonesty, Bowers asked them to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements about cheating. Four of the items were:

> (1) The individual's personal integrity or self-respect should be the basis for the decision not to cheat;
>
> (2) Students are morally obliged not to cheat;
>
> (3) Cheating directly contradicts the goals of education; and
>
> (4) Under no circumstances is cheating justified.[6]

The percentages of students "strongly agreeing" with these items were, respectively, 75, 69, 68, and 63. On the basis of these responses, Bowers concluded:

> As the data clearly show, college students overwhelmingly disapprove of academic dishonesty. . . . More than four out of five students agree with these statements and, just as significantly, more than three in five express a strong agreement. . . .[7]

Bowers goes on to note:

> The almost unanimous disapproval of cheating on the part of the students in our sample. . .is quite startling in view of the sizable proportion who admit to cheating. Apparently, many students who think cheating is morally wrong nonetheless do so. Several conclusions seem justified. First, it is clear that the widespread cheating that occurs on many college campuses does not mean that students hold values that are contrary to those underlying our system of higher education. If college students cheat, it is not because they do not think cheating is wrong. The second conclusion that follows is that there must be powerful forces at work leading students to cheat in spite of their negative attitude toward such behavior.[8]

Bowers' findings make it clear that the overwhelming majority of students normatively disapprove of cheating. The near unanimity of the students' norms against cheating sharply contradicts the popular image of the existence of sizable student subcultures that normatively approve of cheating.

This high degree of personal disapproval does not, however, deter them from cheating. Since the personal norms of students toward cheating failed to account for their own cheating behavior, Bowers sought an explanation in the degree to which they perceived their peers as disapproving of cheating. And he found the perceived peer disapproval of cheating to be a strong determinant of cheating behavior.[9] Since Bowers found this measure to be highly useful, we decided to assess the perception of peer disapproval toward cheating among our high school students.

Perceived Peer Disapproval

To get at their perception we used an item from Bowers' study, "If you had cheated in a course and the following people knew about it, how do you think they would feel about it?"[10] The students were then asked to indicate the degree to which "your close friend," "most students in school," "your teachers," and "your parents," would disapprove of cheating. Ninety per cent and 93% of the students said their parents and teachers, respectively, would "strongly" disapprove of cheating. At the same time, only 8 per cent and 16 per cent, respectively, felt that "most students" or their "closest friend" would strongly disapprove of cheating.

Although our labeling of the role-partners differed somewhat from Bowers, our findings were quite similar to his. In Table VII.1 we have presented the results from both studies.

TABLE VII.1

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OF CHEATING

(A)

BOWERS' DATA[a]

Role-Partners	They would disapprove:				N
	Very Strongly	Fairly Strongly	Not Very Strongly	Not at All	
A close friend	38%	31%	23%	8%	(5,316)
One of the students you go around with	28	36	28	8	(5,310)
A faculty member	89	10	1	---	(5,315)
Your parents	82	15	2	1	(5,300)

(B)

HILL'S DATA

Role-Partners	They would disapprove:				N
	Very Strongly	Fairly Strongly	Not Very Strongly	Not at All	
Your closest friend	16%	20%	36%	28%	(492)
Most students in school	8	23	39	30	(488)
Your teachers	93	6	1	---	(494)
Your parents	90	8	1	1	(493)

[a] Source: William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

It is interesting to note that in both studies, the students tend to perceive a higher degree of cheating disapproval from their "close friend" than from "most students" or "students they go around with." A comparison of the two studies also reveal that college students perceive a much higher degree of peer disapproval than high school students. Thus it is possible that while most college and high school students disapprove of cheating, the intensity of this disapproval is much less among high school students. Yet, interestingly, the rate of cheating among high school students (52%) is equal to that among college students (50%).

Now that we have seen how students perceive their peers disapproval of cheating, let us examine the effect that it has on cheating behavior. As mentioned earlier, Bowers' Index of Perceived Peer Group Disapproval was found to be strongly related to cheating.[11] He constructed this Index by combining the responses to the "a close friend" and "one of the students you go around with" categories. Our Index of Perceived Peer Disapproval consists only of the responses to the "your close friend" category. The relation of our index to cheating resulted in findings that were strikingly similar to Bowers; the comparative data are presented in Table VII.2

TABLE VII.2

CHEATING BY PERCEIVED PEER DISAPPROVAL

BOWERS' DATA[a]		HILL'S DATA	
Index of Perceived Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheating	Index of Perceived Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheating
Very strong	26% (1,352)	Very strong	27% (78)
Fairly strong	41 (657)	Fairly strong	41 (98)
Moderate	49 (1,318)	Not strong	53 (180)
Fairly weak	59 (443)	None at all	71 (146)
Very weak	71 (1,532)		
Per Cent Difference	+45%	Per Cent Difference	+44%

[a] Source: William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty, op. cit., p. 147

The data from both studies clearly indicate that peer disapproval is strongly related to cheating: the weaker the perceived disapproval of peers, the higher the rate of cheating. While only one out of four students cheat when they perceive "very strong" disapproval from their peers, almost three out of four cheat when they perceive "very weak" or "none at all" disapproval from their peers. This variable of peer disapproval accounts for more variance in cheating -- in a two-variable relationship -- than any other variable used thus far in our analysis. It also turned out to be the strongest variable in Bowers' study.[12] Since peer disapproval is an important determinant of cheating behavior, let us see how it is related to the next strongest variable in our study, role type. Since innovators and retreatists cheat more than ritualists and conformists, we would expect the latter to perceive their peers more often as "strongly" disapproving of cheating than the former (see Table VII.3).

TABLE VII.3

PERCEIVED PEER DISAPPROVAL BY ROLE TYPE

Perceived Peer Disapproval	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Very strong	21%	17%	14%	7%
Fairly strong	22	26	20	14
Not strong	39	43	31	42
None at all	18	14	35	37
N	(175)	(35)	(188)	(94)

While 43% of the conformists perceive the disapproval of their peers as "very" or "fairly" strong, only half as many (21%) retreatists perceive their close peers as disapproving strongly. Similarly, while 43% of the ritualists perceive "strong" disapproval of cheating from their peers, 34% of the innovators perceive their peers as disapproving "very" or "fairly" strong. Furthermore, 18% of the conformists say that their peers would "not at all" disapprove, but twice as many innovators (35%) and retreatists (37%) say that their peers would not disapprove at all. Thus it is possible that the differential rates of cheating among the role types can be partly explained by their differential perception of peer disapproval. This differential perception of norms indicate that the normative milieu of the conformists and ritualists differ radically from that of the retreatists, and, to a lesser extent, from that of the innovators. These role types clearly move among different circles of friends: they differentially associate with adolescents who hold opposing normative expectations. The conformists and ritualists feel that their friends strongly disapprove of cheating, while the innovators and retreatists feel that their peers would only disapprove mildly. This provides our first bit of evidence that a sizable degree of normative dissensus exists among adolescents. The extent of this dissensus will be the focus of the next chapter.

That the role types move in different normative milieu might indicate that their cheating behavior is not due to their role adaptation, but to their perception of peer disapproval. In other words, controlling for perception of peer disapproval may drastically reduce the effect of role type on cheating behavior.

TABLE VII.4

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND PEER DISAPPROVAL

Perceived Peer Disapproval	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Very strong	25% (36)	50% (6)	22% (27)	43% (7)	+18%
Fairly strong	32 (38)	44 (9)	43 (37)	54 (13)	+22
Not strong	40 (68)	47 (15)	67 (58)	54 (39)	+14
None at all	59 (32)	60 (5)	77 (66)	80 (35)	+21
Per Cent Difference	+34%	+10%	+55%	+37%	

However, Table VII.4 shows that peer disapproval does not alter the effect of role type on cheating: on every level of peer disapproval, the effect of role type on cheating is either just as strong as it was in the original two-variable relationship, or is strengthened. For example, while there is only a 14% difference in the cheating rates of conformists and retreatists who perceive the disapproval of their peers as "not strong," there is a 27% difference between the rates of conformists and innovators who perceive the disapproval of their peers as "not strong."

In fact, role type weakens the impact of peer disapproval on cheating; for among ritualists perceived peer disapproval has its weakest effect. While 60% of the ritualists who perceive no disapproval from their peers cheat, only ten per cent fewer (50%) ritualists cheat among those who perceive the disapproval of their peers as "very strong." Thus the small effect of perceived peer disapproval on cheating by ritualists coincides with the finding in the previous chapter which showed that the classroom climate of perceived peer disapproval had its weakest effect on cheating by ritualists.

At that time, it was suggested that peer norms had their weakest impace on the behavior of ritualists because they were less integrated in the informal peer social structure. Small group research has shown that individuals who are less integrated in a group tend to be less affected by the norms of that group than those individuals who are much more integrated in the group.[13] We will consider this question further in the next chapter which deals with peer group status and deviance.

Interestingly, peer disapproval has its strongest effect on cheating by innovators. More than three-fourths (77%) of the innovators who perceive no disapproval from their peers cheat, but less than one-fourth (22%) of the innovators who perceive "very strong" disapproval from their peers cheat.

Thus we can conclude that peer disapproval and role type independently determine cheating rates among students. Deviance, therefore, must be explained not only in terms of individual role adaptations, but also in terms of the normative influence from one's peer group. Now that we have observed the effect of peer group norms, we must now consider the medium through which these norms are channeled -- peer group associations.

Peer Group Associations

It was noted above that the student role types perceive different degrees of peer disapproval of cheating because they associate with students in different normative milieu. In other words, conformists and ritualists associate more frequently with students who strongly disapprove of cheating and who use legitimate means to obtain good grades, than innovators and retreatists. The latter, on the other hand, interact more often with students who mildly disapprove of cheating and who resort to illegitimate avenues to obtain satisfactory grades than conformists and ritualists.

As a means of determining the different patterns of peer group associations among adolescents, students were asked this question (taken from the Bowers Study):

> Compared to other students in your class, do you and your close friends participate in extra-curricular activities (. . .in athletics . . . , take an interest in your studies and make good grades, . . . date and have parties, . . .) more than others, about the same, or less than others?[14]

This question was repeated three more times with the substitution of "in athletics," "take an interest in your studies and make good grades," and "date and have parties" for "in extra-curricular activities." We hypothesized that students whose friends took an interest in studies "more than others" belonged to an academically-oriented crowd that consisted primarily of conformists and ritualists. On the other hand, students whose friends participated in athletics or dated and had parties "more than others" belonged to a "socially-oriented" crowd that consisted primarily of innovators and retreatists. Since extra-curricular activities can be both "academically" and "socially" oriented, it was felt that most of the role types had an equal chance of having friends who participated in these activities "more than others." The data in Table VII.5 tend to confirm our hypotheses.

TABLE VII.5

ROLE TYPES BY PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Peer Group Associations of Those Participating "More Than Others"	Student Role Types				N
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Studies	53%	11%	28%	8%	(123)
Extra-curricular	44	10	34	12	(114)
Athletics	33	8	39	20	(132)
Dates, parties	20	6	45	29	(80)
Per Cent Difference	-33%	-5%	+17%	+21%	

Participations in these activities are directly related to our role types: conformists and ritualists associate more with those who over-participate in studies and extra-curricular activities, while innovators and retreatists associate more with those who over-participate in athletics and dates and parties. For example, of those who participate in studies "more than others" more than half (53%) are conformists, while only one-fifth of those who more frequently date and socialize are conformists. On the other hand, only 8% of those who are more involved in studies are retreatists, but 29% of those who date and party more often are retreatists.

Thus it is clear that peer group associations must be added to our list of important sources of role adaptations. Since these differential association patterns can lead to different role adaptations, they should also be considered as possible determinants of cheating behavior.

Peer Associations and Cheating

Bowers combined these association items into an index that classified the value-orientation of the students into four types: the "academically oriented only," "the academically and socially oriented," "the neither academically nor socially oriented" and "the socially oriented only." The "academically oriented only" students were those who over-participated in studying to the exclusion of the other activities, while the "socially oriented only" consisted of those who dated, had parties, etc., to the exclusion of the academic activities. The per cent of students who cheated in each of the four types was 42, 52, 54, and 68, respectively.[15] Thus Bowers obtained a 24% difference between the cheating rate of the academically oriented and that of the socially oriented students. We expect to obtain similar results with our data: those students participating more in studies and extra-curricular activities should cheat less often than those participating more in athletics and parties.

TABLE VII.6

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Per Cent Cheated			
	Peer Group Associations			
	Studies	Extra-Curricular	Athletics	Dates, Parties
More than others	31% (122)	48% (113)	57% (133)	65% (87)
About the same	57 (325)	49 (290)	49 (234)	50 (278)
Less than others	68 (54)	62 (101)	49 (138)	44 (138)
Per Cent Difference	+37%	+14%	-8%	-21%

The data in Table VII.6 strongly confirm our expectations. Looking first at the percentages in each column, we find that the rate of cheating (1) decreases the more students associate with peers who over-emphasize studies and extra-curricular activities, and (2) increases the more students associate with peers who overemphasize sports and parties. Less than one-third of the students who associate "more than others" with the "studious" crowd cheat, but more than two-thirds (68%) of the students whose peers emphasize studies "less than others" cheat. On the other hand, 65% of those who take part in dating and parties "more than others" cheat, but only 44% of those date and party "less than others" cheat. It is of interest to note that while degree of participation in studies has the largest impact (37%) on cheating, degree of participation in athletics has the smallest impact (8%). Thus whether or not students participate in sports "more" or "less" than others does not effectively determine whether or not they will cheat. Because peer group associations are strongly related to role types, it is necessary to assess their independent effects on cheating.

TABLE VII.7

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Peer Group Associations Only of Those "More Than Others"	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Studies	27% (64)	36% (14)	38% (34)	30% (10)	+3%
Extra-curricular	33 (49)	54 (11)	64 (39)	50 (14)	+17%
Athletics	28 (43)	73 (11)	72 (51)	69 (26)	+41%
Dates, parties	44 (16)	60 (5)	81 (36)	74 (23)	+30%
Per Cent Difference	+17%	+24%	+43%	+44%	

Both peer group associations and role adaptations are shown in Table VII.7 to have a strong effect on cheating -- independent of one another. A little more than one-fourth of the conformists who actively engage in athletics cheat, but almost three-fourths of the innovators who participate heavily in sports cheat. It is only with respect to associations with the "studious" crowd that role type has its weakest effect: of the conformists whose peers overemphasize studies 27% cheat, while 30% of the retreatists who associate with the "studious" crowd cheat -- a difference of only 3 per cent. Thus for students whose close friends overemphasize studies, their individual role adaptations will have little effect in determining whether or not they cheat. This is not true, however, for the remaining patterns of peer group associations: role type continues to be a major determinant of cheating behavior regardless of whether students participate more or less in extra-curricular activities, in athletics, or dates and parties.

It is quite important to point out that while perceived peer disapproval had only a slight effect on cheating by ritualists, peer group association does account for a large amount of the variance in cheating by students making this adaptation. Clearly peer group associations have been demonstrated to be important sources of cheating behavior among adolescents.

In sum, we have found that, in general, students internalize the high valuation of academic pursuits held by the dominant society. For example, we have found that most of them feel that young men need at least a college education to get ahead in the world, and that a person who wants to get ahead in life has to do well in school. While high school students do not disapprove of cheating as strongly as college students, they nevertheless overwhelmingly disapprove of it. This personal disapproval, however, does not deter their cheating behavior. It was found that their perceived peer disapproval had a greater impact on this behavior than their own personal disapproval. In fact, perceived peer disapproval affected cheating rates more strongly than role adaptations. Peer group associations were seen to account for a large amount of cheating behavior. Conformists and ritualists more often associated with peers who emphasized studies and extra-curricular activities; innovators and retreatists, on the other hand, more often associated with peers who emphasized athletics, dating and parties.

Since both peer group norms and peer group associations strongly affect cheating behavior, it seems relevant to consider the effect of peer group status on cheating behavior. A number of investigators like Gordon argue that the quest for status in the eyes of their peers is the primary goal of students; in the next chapter we will see if this is so.[16]

Footnotes

1. Neal Gross, et. al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1958); Robert K. Merton, "The Role-Set," British Journal of Sociology, VIII (June, 1957), pp. 106-120; William J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), pp. 483-496.

2. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961); Kingsley Davis, "Adolescence and Social Structure," The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 236 (November 1944), pp. 8-15.

3. Coleman, Ibid.; C. Wayne Gordon, The Social System of the High School, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957); Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten, Society and Education, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), pp. 125-149.

4. Neal Gross, et. al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1958).

5. Coleman, op. cit.

6. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964), p. 69.

7. Ibid., pp. 68-69.

8. Ibid., pp. 69-70.

9. Ibid., pp. 146-150.

10. Ibid., p. 144.

11. Ibid., p. 147.

12. Ibid., p. 199.

13. Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955); Dorwin Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics, (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1962).

14. Bowers, op. cit., p. 119

15. Ibid., p. 126. More specifically, these percentages refer to the high school cheating rate of the college students as related to their high school value-orientation.

16. Gordon, op. cit.

CHAPTER EIGHT

POPULARITY AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Both this chapter and the preceding one constitute the major sections of this analysis that attempt to directly assess the impact of peer group influence on student deviant behavior. The previous chapter focussed on peer group norms and peer group associations; this chapter will concentrate on peer group status. Our purpose here will be three-fold.

First, we will determine the extent to which peer group status is related to role adaptations and cheating behavior. The literature is not at all clear about the relationship between peer status and academic orientation: are the more popular students more academically oriented than the less popular students or is it the reverse? One school of thought suggests that since the dominant value in the school system is "intellectual," high status goes to those students who do best in their school work.[1] According to this view, conformists and ritualists would be more likely to occupy positions of status than innovators and retreatists. Diametrically opposing this position is the view espoused by Coleman: high status is not given for academic achievement, but for proficiency in social activities like sports and dating.[2] Innovators and retreatists, therefore, would occupy the positions of status among their peers. Our problem, therefore, will be to determine whether those making "conforming" adaptations (i.e., the conformists and ritualists) tend to be more or less popular than those making deviant adaptations (i.e., the innovators and retreatists), and whether it is the popular or unpopular students who cheat more often.

Second, an effort will be made to identify the channels by which popularity among student peers is facilitated or obstructed. More specifically, we will examine the degree to which certain kinds of peer group associations enhance the social standing of students among their peers. Thus we will be interested in observing how an overemphasis on studies, extra-curricular activities, sports, and dating affects the status of students among their peers. Since it is probable that certain of these activities, in particular sports, may have differential consequences depending upon whether the student is male or female, we will control for sex in this part of our analysis.

Third, since Coleman's description of the adolescent society has direct implications for our consideration of peer group status as a source of deviant behavior, we will attempt to test the adequacy of Coleman's formulation. Most critics of the "subculture" thesis have attacked it on the grounds that the degree of value dissensus between adults and adolescents is not as great as Coleman suggests. However, we shall challenge this notion on the grounds that the value dissensus among *adolescents* is *just as great* as the value dissensus between adolescents and adults. In other words, we are arguing that the degree of shared values between adults and adolescents is just as great as the degree of shared values among adolescents.

Peer Group Status

Status in the eyes of one's peers is considered by many commentators to be the most sought after goal in American society. This quest on the part of students, in particular, is succinctly presented by Coleman:

> In any social system, status by its very definition is in scarce supply. This is as true in a high school as in society at large. The fundamental competition in a high school is neither for grades, nor for athletic achievements, nor any other such activity. It is a

> competition for recognition and respect -- the elements of which status is composed -- in the eyes of one's fellows and the opposite sex. Competition for scholastic or athletic honors, as well as competition in other activities, is important to the competitors, not on its own account, but because it helps win status in the eyes of other teen-agers.[3]

Peer group status of adolescents is usually discussed in terms of the degree to which students are integrated in the informal peer hierarchy. But Gordon argues that the general status of students results from their relative positions in "formal" and "semi-formal" subsystems as well:

> . . .high school pupils are involved in three 'sub-systems,' (1) the formal scheme of things which includes administration, faculty, curriculum, textbooks, classrooms, grades, rules and regulations; (2) a semi-formal set of sponsored organizations and activities, such as athletics, dramatics, departmental clubs; and (3) the informal, half-world of usually non-recognized and non-approved cliques, factions and fraternities. He [Gordon] found the last to be especially powerful in controlling adolescent behavior, not only in such matters as dress and dating, but also in school achievement and deportment.[4]

Although Gordon examined the role of the "formal" and "semi-formal" subsystems for status, it is important to note that he found the informal status system to be the most powerful determinant of adolescent behavior. His findings coincide with the results we obtained in the preceding chapter which showed the effect of peer group associations on cheating behavior. For, the "informal" activity of dating and parties accounted for much of the cheating among students; the "formal" activity of studies also had a strong impact on cheating; and the "semi-formal" activities of extra-curricular activities and athletics moderately affected the cheating rates among students.

We will use two measures of peer group status that depend on the respondent's self-perception of his social standing among his peers: popularity and membership in the leading crowd. While the self-reports of status may differ from their "true" positions, we are nevertheless interested in how the students themselves perceive their social standing. Numerous investigations have shown that often the "subjective" definition of the situation is a more relevant "social fact" than "objective" reality.[5] Coleman tried to get at both "subjectivity" and "objective" aspects by using student self-reports and the reports of others as his indicators of the status of students among their peers.

Our first measure of peer group status, popularity, was obtained by asking students the following question, "How popular would you say you are with the other students in the tenth grade -- more popular than most, about as popular as most, or not as popular as most?" The second measure, which was taken from Coleman's study was, "Would you say you are a member of the leading crowd in the tenth grade?" Students responding "more popular than most" to the first question, and "yes" to the second, were considered as occupying "high" status positions, while those giving alternative responses were characterized as holding "low" status positions. In Table VIII.1 we have presented the marginal frequencies of the responses to both questions.

TABLE VIII.1

POPULARITY AND LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP

Degree of Self-Perceived Popularity	Marginal Frequencies	Membership in Leading Crowd	Marginal Frequencies
More popular than most About as popular Not as popular	8% 80 12	Yes No	50% 50
N =	100% (494)	N =	100% (383)

First, it should be noted that while 50 per cent of the students said that they were members of the leading crowd, only 8 per cent of the students saw themselves as "more popular than others." Since popularity is a more scarce commodity than membership in the leading crowd, the different frequency distributions are not surprising. However, the much larger proportion of students who saw themselves as members of the leading crowd but not as "more popular" indicates that popularity and leading crowd membership involve independent -- though related -- status hierarchies. The difference between the two can be described as follows: the "more popular" students are situated on the apex of a pyramid, while "leading crowd members" are located on the plateau of a truncated pyramid. In short, there is more room at the top for membership in the leading crowd than there is for achieving a high degree of popularity among one's peers. This conceptual distinction between the two status hierarchies is not made by Coleman; as a result, he uses the terms interchangeably. Our analysis will indicate that by keeping "popularity" distinct from "leading crowd membership," one is better able to describe the dynamics of the relationship between peer group status and adolescent role behavior.

As we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there are two conflicting schools of thought which describe the relationship between peer group status and school behavior. One school, to which Coleman belongs, emphasizes the importance of achievement in "social" spheres for status. The other, of which Lipset and Bendix are members, see it in terms of "intellectual" achievement:

> The subculture of the school is almost everywhere defined largely in intellectual terms. High status within a school's social system is given to those who are best in their school work (although non-intel-

lectual factors such as athletic prowess and social class background also affect status within schools).[6]

In order for Lipset and Bendix's position to be upheld, the conformists and ritualists should, on the average, be more popular than innovators and retreatists. Support for Coleman's view, on the other hand, would require that the innovators and retreatists be more popular than conformists and ritualists. Since peer group status is conceived as a source of our role types, we have percentaged the data in Table VIII.2 in the direction of the independent variable -- peer group status.

TABLE VIII.2

ROLE TYPE BY PEER GROUP STATUS

(A)

Degree of Popularity	Role Type by Popularity				N
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
More popular	29%	7%	36%	28%	(42)
Same	36	6	38	20	(394)
Less popular	35	12	43	10	(58)
Per Cent Difference	+6%	+5%	+7%	-18%	

(B)

Membership in Leading Crowd	Role Type by Leading Crowd Membership				N
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Yes	38%	7%	35%	20%	(193)
No	32	7	42	19	(190)
Per Cent Difference	-6%	0%	+7%	-1%	

As far as popularity is concerned, the percentage differences indicate that conformists, ritualists, and innovators tend to be "less" popular than others, while retreatists are the only role type that is over-represented among the students who are "more" popular than others.

With regard to leading crowd membership, a different pattern emerges: conformists are more likely to be members of the leading crowd, while innovators are more likely not to be leading crowd members. Ritualists and retreatists, however, have the same chances of being in the leading crowd as they do of being out of it.

In sum, conformists are less popular but belong to the leading crowd; innovators are both less popular and non-members of the leading crowd; retreatists are more popular and have a 50-50 chance of belonging to the leading crowd; and the ritualists are less popular and have a 50-50 chance of belonging to the leading crowd. Knowing the differential involvement of our role types in various kinds of peer activities, we can draw the following tentative conclusions: (1) over-involvement in studies and extra-curricular activities help the conformists and, to a lesser degree, the ritualists to gain admittance to the leading crowd, but over-involvement in these activities decreases their chances for being popular; (2) over-participation in athletics, dating and parties help to make retreatists popular, but they do not necessarily help them to get into the leading crowd; (3) despite the fact that innovators over-participate in athletics and dating, these activities are not sufficient to help them gain popularity or membership in the leading crowd. On the whole, ritualists and innovators tend to occupy lower status positions than conformists and retreatists.

That retreatists are the most popular of the role types sharply contradicts the image of retreatists that is presented by Merton in his theory of anomie; he describes them as "pariahs" who are "in the society but not of it."[7] The retreatists in our study clearly are not "outcasts"; so what is the explanation for this contradictory finding?

First, it should be recalled that in his original essay on anomie, Merton was referring to adaptations that individuals made in the society at large; second, the goal that Merton used for illustrative purposes was that of monetary success.[8] We, on the other hand, are examining role adaptations within a subsystem of society, the high school system; and the goal that is the focus of this analysis is academic success. Thus while individuals who retreat from the value of monetary success to become hoboes, hermits, drug addicts, etc., can be considered, in a sense, as pariahs or outcasts, students who retreat from academic success to become athletic stars of "socialites" cannot be described in such terms. On the contrary, it appears that ritualists, innovators and, to some degree, conformists fit the description of "pariah" better than retreatists. Thus Merton's assertions about the relative popularity of the role types depend upon (1) the particular subsystem under investigation and (2) the goal that has been selected for study.[9]

Now that we have seen that popularity and leading crowd membership are both related to various role types, let us examine their relationship to cheating behavior. Since retreatists are the most popular of the role types, we would expect cheating to increase with popularity. We cannot make any predictions with regard to the effect of leading crowd membership on cheating, since it had inverse effects on conformists and innovators.

TABLE VIII.3

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP STATUS

Degree of Popularity	Per Cent Cheating	Membership in Leading Crowd	Per Cent Cheating
More than others	60% (45)	Yes	57% (198)
Same	51 (401)	No	51% (193)
Less than others	47 (60)		
Per Cent Difference	-13%	Per Cent Difference	-6%

As predicted, Table VIII.3 shows that popularity is positively related to cheating. While less than half (47%) of the less popular students cheat, 60% of the more popular students cheat. Similarly, cheating increases with membership in the leading crowd. More than half (51%) of the non-members cheat, but 57% of the members cheat. It seems evident therefore that the pressure for cheating is greater upon those occupying positions of status than upon those occupying the lower positions in the status hierarchy. But does popularity and leading crowd membership have this effect upon cheating regardless of one's role adaptation? In other words, for example, do the popular conformists cheat as often as the popular retreatists? Let us examine the data in Table VIII.4 to find out.

First of all, the data indicate that both popularity and role types have very strong independent effects on cheating. Among the "more" popular students the innovators exhibit the highest rate of cheating: only one-third of the more popular conformists cheat, but four-fifths of the more popular innovators cheat. Role type introduces an important specification of the effect of popularity on cheating: while popularity is positively related to cheating among innovators and retreatists, it is negatively related to

TABLE VIII.4

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND POPULARITY

Degree of Popularity	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Type				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
More	33% (12)	33% (3)	80% (15)	75% (12)	+42%
Same	39 (142)	44 (25)	58 (149)	64 (77)	+25%
Less	40 (20)	71 (7)	56 (25)	17 (6)	-23%
Per Cent Difference	+7%	+38%	-24%	-58%	

cheating among conformists and ritualists. This inverse effect of popularity on cheating among the role types is further evidence of the existence of diametrically opposite norms and values within the adolescent society. The cheaters among the innovators and retreatists are the "popular heroes," while the cheaters among the conformists and ritualists are the pariahs. We shall return to this point a little later in this chapter.

Popularity has been shown to have strong independent effects on cheating; now let us examine Table VIII.5 to determine the effect of leading crowd membership on cheating controlling for student role adaptation.

Once again, the high status students among the innovators and retreatists cheat more often than those occupying low positions. A little more than half of the retreatists who are not members of the leading crowd cheat, but about three-fourths of the retreatists who are members of the leading crowd cheat. On the other hand, among the conformists and ritualists, it is the non-members who cheat more often. Thus leading crowd membership, like popularity, is positively related to cheating among innovators and retreatists, but negatively related to cheating among conformists and ritualists. There-

TABLE VIII.5

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPE AND LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP

Membership in Leading Crowd	Per Cent Cheated				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Type				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Yes	40% (74)	50% (14)	64% (67)	76% (38)	+36%
No	42 (59)	57 (14)	57 (80)	53 (36)	+13%
Per Cent Difference	+2%	+7%	-7%	-23%	

fore, among the conformists and ritualists, the *greatest pressures for cheating* are exerted upon those occupying *low* positions in the peer status hierarchy, while among the innovators and retreatists, the greatest pressures for cheating are exerted upon those occupying *high* status positions. This result forces us to further respecify Merton's proposition that pressures for deviance increase as one goes *down* the status hierarchy. With regard to the informal status hierarchy of adolescents this hypothesis holds only for cheating rates among conformists or ritualists, it does not apply to rates of cheating among innovators and retreatists.

Peer Group Associations and Peer Group Status

The previous section demonstrated that retreatists are more popular than the other role types, but that students who were conformists were more likely to be members of the leading crowd than students who made other role adaptations. Since the preceding chapter indicated that these role types differentially associated with those participating in various peer activities, it is likely that these activities are the source of students' popularity and leading crowd membership. In Table VIII.6 we related peer group associations to popularity.

TABLE VIII.6

POPULARITY BY PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Per Cent "More" Popular			
	Peer Group Associations			
	Studies	Extra-Curricular	Athletics	Dates, Parties
More	11% (123)	14% (114)	20% (134)	21% (87)
Same	7 (325)	6 (290)	4 (234)	6 (279)
Less	20 (54)	11 (101)	6 (138)	8 (138)
Per Cent Difference	+9%	-3%	-14%	-13%

The activities that have the best chances of enhancing a student's popularity are sports and dates and parties: association with those who overemphasize sports or dating gives students more popularity than association with students who overemphasize studies -- which decreases one's chances for popularity. These findings agree with Coleman's results that also showed that an overemphasis on studies reduces students' chances for obtaining popularity among their peers.[10] Let us now examine Table VIII.7 to see whether there is a similar relationship between peer group associations and membership in the leading crowd.

While dating, athletics, and extra-curricular activities are more important channels than studies for obtaining membership in the leading crowd, extra-curricular activities is now a more important source of peer group status than athletics. And dates and parties is a more important source of

TABLE VIII.7

LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP BY PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Per Cent "Yes" Leading Crowd							
	Peer Group Associations							
	Studies		Extra-Curricular		Athletics		Dates, Parties	
More	53%	(99)	68%	(100)	62%	(113)	72%	(72)
Same	49	(245)	45	(221)	49	(176)	54	(210)
Less	59	(44)	42	(69)	40	(102)	30	(107)
Per Cent Difference	+6%		-26%		-22%		-42%	

leading crowd membership than any of the other three activities. Since Coleman tended to play down the role of extra-curricular activities as a channel for peer group status, it is quite interesting to note that when it comes to leading crowd membership, extra-curricular activities is just as important a source of status as sports.[11]

We can sum up our findings thus far as follows: (1) as channels for gaining popularity, the rank order of the peer activities is (in terms of decreasing importance) athletics, dates and parties, extra-curricular activities and studies; (2) as avenues for membership in the leading crowd, the rank order of the activities is (also in terms of decreasing importance) dates and parties, extra-curricular activities, athletics and studies.

It now becomes evident why it was necessary to keep leading crowd membership conceptually distinct from popularity: the importance of athletics as a channel for peer group status depends partly on whether one is referring to "popularity" or "leading crowd membership." Since Coleman's propositions concerning status in the peer group are contingent on the sex

TABLE VIII.8

POPULARITY BY SEX AND PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Per Cent "More Popular Than Others"							
	Peer Group Associations							
	Studies		Extra-Curricular		Athletics		Dates, Parties	
	Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex	
	(1) Male	(2) Female	(3) Male	(4) Female	(5) Male	(6) Female	(7) Male	(8) Female
More	12% (60)	10% (63)	18% (61)	2% (53)	24% (90)	11% (44)	32% (54)	3% (33)
Same	11 (178)	1 (147)	9 (160)	2 (130)	7 (125)	1 (109)	7 (149)	5 (130)
Less	22 (45)	11 (9)	16 (62)	3 (39)	7 (69)	4 (69)	11 (80)	3 (58)
Per Cent Difference	+10%	+1%	-2%	-6%	-17%	-7%	-21%	0%

of the student, it is necessary to see whether these findings hold when sex is controlled for.

First, a comparison of the percentage differences at the base of the odd-numbered columns in Table VIII.8 indicates that dating and parties is the primary channel of popularity for boys; athletics is a close second (with a -17% difference), and extra-curricular activities (with a -2% difference) is a distant third avenue for gaining popularity. For girls, the percentage differences at the base of the even-numbered columns reveal that both athletics and extra-curricular activities are the primary avenues for achieving popularity. Whether girls are over-involved or under-involved in dating and studies, surprisingly, has no effect upon their popularity: their chances of being unpopular are just as great as their chances of being popular. These findings were not expected since we anticipated that dating and parties would be the primary channel of popularity for girls, not for boys. It should also be noted that while degree of involvement in studies does not determine a girl's popularity, over-involvement in studies by boys sharply reduces their chances of achieving popularity among their peers. Let us now examine Table VIII.9 to see whether similar findings result when leading crowd membership is the dependent variable.

TABLE VIII.9

LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP BY SEX AND PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Per Cent "Yes" Lead Crowd Member							
	Peer Group Associations							
	Studies		Extra-Curricular		Athletics		Dates, Parties	
	Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex	
	(1) Male	(2) Female	(3) Male	(4) Female	(5) Male	(6) Female	(7) Male	(8) Female
More	49% (45)	56% (54)	67% (52)	69% (48)	67% (73)	53% (40)	76% (42)	67% (30)
Same	53 (139)	43 (106)	50 (123)	39 (98)	50 (96)	49 (80)	55 (116)	53 (94)
Less	60 (35)	56 (9)	43 (44)	40 (25)	39 (51)	41 (51)	34 (61)	24 (46)
Per Cent Difference	+11%	0%	-24%	-29%	-28%	-12%	-42%	-43%

These results are more along the lines we had anticipated. Comparison of the percentage differences at the base of the odd-numbered columns indicates that the rank order of the activities in terms of their importance as channels for boys gaining membership in the leading crowd remains the same as it was for boys' popularity: dating, athletics, extra-curricular activities and studies. This time, however, dates and parties is a much more important channel of peer status than athletics; and extra-curricular activities is just as important an avenue for boys' membership in the leading crowd as athletics. Extra-curricular activities, therefore, should not be considered -- as it is by Coleman -- as a female endeavor; boys have about the same chances as girls of gaining membership in the leading crowd through extra-curricular activities.

For girls, however, the relative impact of the various peer group activities on membership in the leading crowd differs sharply from their effect on popularity. Comparing the percentage differences at the base of the even-numbered columns in Table VIII.9 we find that dating is the primary channel for girls gaining membership in the leading crowd of their peers. Thus while dating does not determine whether or not girls will be popular, it does affect their chances for becoming members of the leading crowd. Degree of involvement in extra-curricular activities is the second most important determinant of whether girls will gain admittance to the leading crowd; participation in athletics ranks third; and involvement in studies is fourth.

In sum, degree of involvement in extra-curricular activities and athletics determines a girl's chances for gaining popularity, while involvement in dating and studies does not determine their popularity. At the same time, the chances of girls becoming members of the leading crowd depends on their degree of participation in the following activities (in terms of decreasing importance): dates and parties, extra-curricular activities, athletics, and studies.

For boys, however, their chances for gaining popularity among their peers depend primarily on their degree of participation in dating and athletics. But their chances for gaining membership in the leading crowd depends primarily on their degree of involvement in dating and, secondly, on their participation in extra-curricular activities and athletics. It is very important to re-emphasize that extra-curricular activities is just as important a channel toward leading crowd membership for boys as sports. Throughout his study, Coleman plays down the importance of extra-curricular activities for boys:

> . . .in general, it seems that there is a kind of tacit division of labor in most schools: activities and clubs are for the girls, athletics are for the boys.[12]

While it is true that athletics is not an important avenue for peer group status for girls, extra-curricular activities is a very important avenue for boys. In fact, as the data in Table VIII.10 indicate, boys participate in extra-curricular activities to the same extent as girls.

TABLE VIII.10

PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS BY SEX

Peer Group Associations	Per Cent Participating "More Than Others" Students' Sex		Per Cent Difference
	Male	Female	
Studies	21% (283)	29% (219)	+7%
Extra-curricular	22 (283)	24 (222)	+2%
Athletics	32 (284)	20 (222)	-12%
Dates, parties	19 (283)	15 (221)	-4%

For while 24% of the girls participate in extra-curricular activities "more than others," 22% of the boys also participate in these activities "more than others." And, while a larger proportion of girls (29%) than boys (21%) over-participate in studies, a larger proportion of boys (32%) than girls (20%) are over-involved in athletics. Boys tend to be slightly more involved in dating and parties than girls.

It appears that this differential participation of the sexes in various peer group activities may affect our findings on the influence of peer group associations on cheating behavior in the preceding chapter. For we found, at that time, that students who associated with peers who over-participated in extra-curricular activities and studies cheat less than those with socially-oriented peers. Do these relationships hold when sex is controlled for?

TABLE VIII.11

CHEATING BY SEX AND PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Degree of Participation	Peer Group Associations							
	Studies		Extra-Curricular		Athletics		Dates, Parties	
	Per Cent Cheated		Per Cent Cheated		Per Cent Cheated		Per Cent Cheated	
	Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex		Students' Sex	
	(1) Male	(2) Female	(3) Male	(4) Female	(5) Male	(6) Female	(7) Male	(8) Female
More	40% (60)	23% (62)	57% (61)	37% (52)	66% (90)	40% (43)	65% (54)	67% (33)
Same	58 (178)	54 (147)	53 (160)	44 (130)	50 (125)	49 (109)	56 (149)	44 (129)
Less	64 (45)	89 (9)	60 (62)	67 (39)	52 (69)	46 (69)	48 (80)	40 (58)
Per Cent Difference	+24%	+66%	+3%	+30%	-14%	+6%	-17%	-27%

With the exception of athletics, Table VIII.11 indicates that the relationship between peer group associations and cheating -- when sex is controlled for -- remains very similar to what it was in the original two-variable relationship. Those who participate less in studies and extra-curricular activities, whether boys or girls, cheat more often than those who participate more in these endeavors; and those who participate more in dating and parties, whether boys or girls, cheat more than those who are less involved in these activities. But degree of involvement in athletics has inverse effects for males and females: boys who participate more in athletics cheat more often than those whose participation is less; girls, however, who overparticipate in athletics cheat less often than those girls whose involvement is less.

Since sex specifies the effect of sports on cheating, we will limit the use of this activity in much of our later discussions of the effect of peer group associations. As a matter of fact, so that we do not have to control for sex in these discussions, we will restrict much of the later analysis to the two activities upon which sex has the weakest effects: dating and studies.

Before proceeding to a test of Coleman's subculture thesis, we will summarize our findings thus far: (1) students who are retreatists tend to be more popular than students who are conformists, ritualists, or innovators; and students who are conformists are more likely to be members of the leading crowd than students making any other adaptation, while innovators are less likely to be members of the leading crowd than any other role types; (2) on the whole, the more popular students and the leading crowd members cheat more often than the less popular students and the non-members of leading crowds; (3) the more popular innovators and retreatists cheat more often than the less popular innovators and retreatists, but the more popular conformists and ritualists cheat less often than the less popular conformists and ritualists; (4) similarly, innovators and retreatists who are members of the leading crowd cheat more than those who are non-members, while conformists and ritualists who are leading crowd members cheat less often than those who are non-members; (5) greater involvement in dates, parties, athletics, and extra-curricular activities increase one's chances for becoming popular or being admitted to the leading crowd, but greater involvement in studies decreases those chances; (6) girls participate in studies more than boys, while boys participate in athletics more than girls, but both participate in extra-curricular activities and dating to the same degree; (7) regardless of whether a student is a boy or girl: the more he participates in studies and extra-curricular activities the less likely he is to cheat, but the more he participates in dating and parties the more likely is he to cheat; (8) boys who overparticipate in sports cheat more than those who participate less, while girls who over-participate in sports cheat less than those whose participation is less.

Peer Group Status and Academic Achievement

That cheaters occupy positions of very high status among innovators and retreatists, but hold positions of very low status among conformists and ritualists underscores the differential normative orientations held by these opposing sets of role types. One way of determining the degree of value dissensus among students is to specify the differential status accorded to students who obtain high grades among the various role types. Where the "smart" student has high status, academic achievement can be considered to be an important criterion of evaluation for that status hierarchy; and, where the "smart" student holds a very low status position, academic achievement cannot be considered to be an important value for status. But first we must determine how grades are related to peer group status. Who gets higher grades, the bright student or the poor student? In Table VIII.12 we indicate how popularity and leading crowd membership are each related to grades.

TABLE VIII.12

GRADES BY PEER GROUP STATUS

Degree of Popularity	Grades (Per Cent A or B)	Membership in Leading Crowd	Grades (Per Cent A or B)
More	49% (45)	Yes	49% (195)
Same	43 (395)	No	42 (193)
Less	37 (59)		
Per Cent Difference	-12%	Per Cent Difference	-7%

Since the rate of cheating increased with peer group status, it is somewhat surprising to note that grades also increase with status in the peer group. For example, slightly more than one-third (37%) of the students who see themselves as less popular obtain B or higher grades, but about one-half (49%) of those who perceive themselves as more popular obtain grades of B or higher. Similarly, 49% of leading crowd members have B or higher grades, only 42% of the non-members have B or higher grades. Thus the students who occupy high positions in the peer hierarchy have higher grades than those occupying low status positions. This would seem to indicate that academic -- not social -- success is the primary criterion of evaluation for positions of status among adolescents. Although he failed to emphasize it, Coleman also found that the leading crowd members and the more popular students obtained higher grades than the lower status students.[13] However, before we conclude that students accord high status to those with high grades, let us observe this relationship between peer group status and grades when role adaptation is controlled for.

TABLE VIII.13

GRADES BY ROLE TYPE AND POPULARITY

Degree of Popularity	Per Cent A or B				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
More	83% (12)	67% (3)	47% (15)	17% (12)	-66%
Same	55 (141)	60 (25)	38 (147)	24 (74)	-31%
Less	70 (20)	0 (7)	25 (24)	33 (6)	-37%
Per Cent Difference	-13%	-67%	-25%	+16%	

The data in Table VIII.13 reveal that the most popular students among conformists, ritualists and innovators are those receiving the highest grades. Retreatists are the only students who accord the highest positions of status to those with the lowest grades: while one-third of the less popular retreatists receive grades of B or higher, only 17% of the more popular retreatists receive those grades. We can conclude therefore that retreatists do not consider academic achievement to be an important criterion for bestowing status among their peers. None of the other role types -- including the innovators -- give high status to those who are academic failures. In Table VIII.14 we obtain similar results when leading crowd membership instead of popularity is the dependent variable.

Once again, the conformists, ritualists, and innovators accord high status, in this case leading crowd membership, to those obtaining the highest grades. But, and also again, retreatists exclude students with high grades from membership in their leading crowd. Thus we see the existence of at least two leading crowds: one is academically-oriented and the other

TABLE VIII.14

GRADES BY ROLE TYPE AND LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP

Membership in Leading Crowd	Per Cent A or B				Per Cent Difference
	Student Role Types				
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	
Yes	67% (73)	57% (14)	42% (66)	19% (37)	-48%
No	61 (59)	43 (14)	33 (80)	31 (36)	-30%
Per Cent Difference	-6%	-14%	-9%	+12%	

socially-oriented. In the socially-oriented crowd, which is dominated by retreatists, academic success is not an important criterion for obtaining high status; but, in the academically-oriented crowd, which is dominated by conformists and ritualists, academic achievement is one of the most important means of gaining status. Thus the innovators are torn between these two conflicting value-orientations. Although innovators have more in common with retreatists than they do with ritualists or conformists in most of their behavior and attitudes, this was the first occasion that they were more like conformists and ritualists than like the retreatists. This undoubtedly means that the attainment of good grades is where the ambivalence among innovators becomes evident -- the grades of leading crowd members are not what gives them status among the innovators -- it is their over-participation in social activities that gives them this status.

In Table VIII.15 it can be seen that while the leading crowd members who are conformists participate most in studies and extra-curricular activities, the leading crowd members among the innovators participate most in athletics and extra-curricular activities. And the retreatists who are members of the leading crowd participate most in athletics and dating and parties.

TABLE VIII.15

PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS BY ROLE TYPE AND LEADING CROWD MEMBERS

Peer Group Associations	Leading Crowd Members Only			
	Per Cent Participating "More than Others" Among:			
	Student Role Types			
	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists
Studies	40% (73)	36% (14)	22% (67)	8% (38)
Extra-curricular	42 (74)	57 (14)	32 (66)	21 (38)
Athletics	28 (74)	50 (14)	39 (67)	40 (38)
Dates, parties	18 (74)	29 (14)	25 (67)	42 (38)
Per Cent Difference	-22%	-7%	+3%	+34%

It is interesting to note that the highest per cent of innovators who are leading crowd members participate most in *athletics*, not dates and parties, as the high status retreatists do. Thus it is evident that innovators are oriented to two conflicting goals: academic success and social success; this *ambivalence* on their part will be seen to be the major factor for the high pressures for cheating and the high rates of cheating among innovators. Consequently, the value-orientation of innovators is not an "orientation" at all, but a state of "disorientation." Since this will become more evident as we proceed along in this chapter, we shall now turn our attention to the value-orientations that Coleman said existed in the adolescent subculture.

Value-Orientations of Boys

Our examination of Coleman's notion of the "adolescent subculture" will be restricted to his comments pertaining to boys. The value-orientations of girls will not be dealt with by us because the ambiguity in many of the items for females makes Coleman's findings concerning girls' value preferences more dubious than his findings about boys' value preferences. For example, it is quite debatable whether a girl's preference for "extra-curricular activities leader" can be considered as "anti-educational" as a boy's preference for "an athletic star."

In order to assess their value-orientations, Coleman asked the boys:

> If you could be remembered here at school for one of the three things below, which one would you want it to be: brilliant student, athletic star, or most popular?[14]

He then asked the students' parents (mostly mothers) to indicate which one of the three items would they most want their sons to be remembered as. We repeated these items from Coleman's study and had both the students and their mothers indicate their value preferences; Table VIII.16 presents the results from both our study and Coleman's.

The similarity in the response patterns of the two studies is remarkable. The rank-order of the value preferences of the mothers in our sample not only was identical to the rank-ordering by the mothers in Coleman's study, but the frequency percentages were almost identical as well. For example, 78% of the mothers in Coleman's study selected "brilliant student" as their first choice for what they wanted to have their son remembered as, while 75% of the mothers in our study made the same choice.

TABLE VIII.16

VALUE PREFERENCES OF MOTHERS AND BOYS: COLEMAN'S ITEMS

(A)

COLEMAN'S DATA[a]			HILL'S DATA		
Rank	Mothers Want Sons to Be Remembered As:	Per Cent	Rank	Mothers Want Sons to Be Remembered As:	Per Cent
1	Brilliant student	78%	1	Brilliant student	75%
2	Most popular	13	2	Most popular	17
3	Athletic star	9	3	Athletic star	8
	N =	([b])		N =	(215)

(B)

COLEMAN'S DATA				HILL'S DATA		
Rank	Boys Want to Be Remembered As:	Per Cent		Rank	Boys Want to Be Remembered As:	Per Cent
		Fall	Spring			
2	Brilliant student	31%	32%	2	Brilliant student	34%
3	Most popular	25	23	3	Most popular	27
1	Athletic star	44	45	1	Athletic star	39
	N =	(3,696)	(3,690)		N =	(259)

[a] Source: James S. Coleman, *Adolescent Society* (New York: Free Press, 1961), pp. 30, 33.

[b] Coleman did not indicate the sample size of the students' parents; these figures were obtained from a graph, Figure 2.8, on p. 33.

The value-preference expressed by the boys themselves in the two studies are also identical: athletic star is the first preference of most of the boys, this is followed by "brilliant student," which in turn is succeeded by "most popular." The mothers, however, ranked the athletic star last (that is, third). That the boys selected the athletic star over the brilliant student was interpreted by Coleman to indicate the degree to which "the adolescent culture departs from the educational norms."[15] He goes on to observe that, "the importance of athletics in these cultures is striking, particularly when we realize that the school as an institution is designed to focus attention on studies and, presumably, upon the brilliant student."[16]

That athletic star is ranked first in the students' value hierarchy and last in the mothers' is further interpreted by Coleman as confirmation for the existence of an adolescent subculture whose values are in sharp conflict with those of their parents. However, we shall now demonstrate that the same degree of value dissensus that Coleman sees between adolescents and their parents exists among the adolescents themselves. In Table VIII.17 we have related role type to boys' value-preference.

TABLE VIII.17

BOYS' VALUE-PREFERENCE BY ROLE TYPE

Total Rank Order	Boys Want to Be Remembered As:	Student Role Type							
		Conformists		Ritualists		Innovators		Retreatists	
		Rank Order	Per Cent	Rank Order	Per Cent	Rank Order	Per Cent	Rank Order	Per Cent
2	Brilliant student	1	45%	1	50%	2	37%	3	14%
3	Most popular	2	29	2	38	3	20	2	32
1	Athletic star	3	26	3	12	1	43	1	54
	N =		(73)		(16)		(124)		(56)

Looking first at the rank-ordering within each role type we see that the conformists and ritualists have identical rankings: "brilliant student" is ranked first, "most popular," second, and "athletic star," third and last. This is the same rank-ordering as that of the mothers of the students. The retreatists, on the other hand, have a rank-ordering that is the inverse of the ranking by the conformists and ritualists: that is, athletic star ranks first, followed by most popular, and brilliant student, last. The innovators, however, express their ambivalence by ranking athletic star first and brilliant student, second. Thus in the value hierarchy of conformists and ritualists the goal of academic success is more highly evaluated than the goal of social success; in the value hierarchy of retreatists, on the other hand, social success is given priority over academic success; but in the value system of innovators academic and social success are of equal high rank. These findings have the following implications:

(1) That the rank ordering of the value-preferences of conformists and ritualist are identical to those of mothers indicate that students with these role adaptations have more values in common with their parents than with students making adaptations of innovation or retreatism. As a result, there is at least as much value consensus between adolescents and adults as there is among adolescents.

(2) That students, in general, do not have -- as Coleman claims -- a value-orientation that ranks social values over academic goals. Theirs is an "ambivalent" value orientation that assigns equal rank to the goals of academic achievement and social success. Since innovation is the role type with the largest number (189) of students, the "average" high school boy should be considered as an innovator, not as a retreatist.

Because innovators value highly both academic and social values, they set an ambivalent tone for students, as a whole. This explains why the students, in general, rank brilliant student second to athletic star instead of third. The other minority role types do not experience value conflict to this degree because they are oriented to only one value: conformists and ritualists to academic ends and retreatists to social ends.[17]

The ambivalence among adolescent boys can be seen more clearly with regard to their specific job preferences. Coleman used such an item as additional conformation of the existence of an adolescent subculture whose value-orientation is "anti-academic." He asked the boys to select the one occupation out of four that they most wanted to be in: jet pilot, nationally famous athlete, missionary, and atomic scientist.

About 37 per cent of the boys expressed a preference for "nationally famous athlete," 31 per cent preferred "jet pilot," 26 per cent preferred "atomic scientist," and only 6 per cent preferred "missionary." That the atomic scientist ran a "poor third after the jet pilot," Coleman says, is another indication of "the way in which the adolescent culture departs from the educational norm."[18] We also asked this question in our study, but the number of occupations was expanded to permit the students to make salient choices from a wider range of alternatives. These occupations were added to determine whether Coleman's results were merely artifacts of the four alternatives he provided, or were salient selections that accurately reflected their hierarchy of values.

A list of fourteen occupations was presented to both the students and their mothers. The students were asked to indicate their first, second, and third preferences; the mothers were asked to indicate their first and second choices (that is, the jobs that the mothers most wanted their sons to go into).[19]

Each of the fourteen occupations was ranked on the basis of the total number of first and second choices that it received from the respondents.

Consequently, we obtained six rank-orderings: the mothers' ranking, the over-all ranking for students, and the rank-ordering for each of the four role types. These rank-orderings are presented in Table VIII.18. The last two columns in that table supply additional information: column (7) indicates -- for each of the fourteen occupations -- the difference between the rank position given to it by mothers and the rank position given to it by students, as a whole. Column (8) presents -- also for each of the fourteen occupations -- the difference between the rank position given to it by conformists and the rank position given to it by retreatists. In short, column (7) is the difference between the ranks indicated in columns (1) and (6), while column (8) is the difference between the ranks indicated in columns (2) and (5). Column (7), therefore, measures the degree of value dissensus between students and their parents; and column (8) measures the degree of value dissensus among adolescents, or more specifically, between conformists and retreatists.

A "zero," for example, in column (7) denotes "full consensus" or "no dissensus" between parents and students for that particular occupation. A "plus" (+) sign indicates that students rank that occupation higher than mothers, while a "minus" (-) sign reveals that students rank that occupation lower than mothers. For example, "-5" in column (7) shows that "college professor" was ranked by students five positions lower than that which mothers gave it. In column (8), the rank differences between conformists and retreatists are indicated. One of the largest differences ("+4) occurs in their differential ranking of "garage mechanic," where retreatists rank this occupation four positions higher than conformists rank it. Thus retreatists evaluate the job of garage mechanic more highly than conformists.

TABLE VIII.18

RANK ORDERING OF OCCUPATIONAL PREFERENCES OF MOTHERS AND STUDENT ROLE TYPES

Occupational Preferences	Rankings						Rank Differences	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Mothers	Conformists	Ritualists	Innovators	Retreatists	Students Over-all	(1)-(6) Mother-Student	(2)-(5) Conformists-Retreatists
1) Doctor	1 (74)[a]	2 (23)	3 (4)	3 (34)	4 (7)	3 (68)	-2	-2
2) Businessman	2 (69)	1 (24)	2 (5)	4 (26)	3 (9)	4 (64)	-2	-2
3) Lawyer	3 (64)	1 (24)	5 (2)	2 (35)	3 (9)	2 (70)	+1	-2*
4) College Professor	4 (60)	5 (10)	5 (2)	9 (11)	7 (3)	9 (26)	-5*[c]	-2
5) Scientist	5 (55)	3 (21)	1 (7)	5 (23)	2 (11)	5 (52)	0	+1*
6) Professonal Athlete	6 (29)	4 (15)	4 (3)	1 (39)	1 (23)	1 (80)	+5*	+3
7) Electrician	7 (26)	4 (15)	6 (1)	6 (22)	3 (9)	6 (47)	+1	+1
8) Garage Mechanic	8 (14)	6 (7)	5 (2)	7 (14)	2 (11)	8 (34)	0	+4*
9) Missionary	9 (9)	8 (1)	7 (0)	11 (7)	8 (2)	12 (10)	-3*	0
10) Insurance Salesman	10 (8)	7 (3)	7 (0)	12 (5)	8 (2)	12 (10)	-2*	-1
11) Airplane Pilot	11 (7)	6 (7)	3 (4)	8 (13)	2 (11)	7 (35)	+4	+4
12) Policeman	11 (7)	9 (0)	7 (0)	10 (9)	5 (5)	10 (14)	+1	+4*
13) Mothers: Elevator Operator[b] Students: Factory Worker	12 (3)	7 (3)	6 (1)	13 (3)	6 (4)	11 (11)	+1	+1
14) Bus Driver	13 (2)	9 (0)	6 (1)	12 (5)	9 (1)	13 (7)	0	0
Totals (N)	(243)	(77)	(16)	(123)	(54)	(270)		

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of first and second choices that occupation received; this is why the sum of these figures is greater than base figure (N).

[b] Elevator Operator was used instead of Factory Worker on the mothers' list; the students had only Factory Worker.

[c] When there is a discrepancy between the figures in columns (7) and (8), the asterisk indicates the column in which the larger discrepancy occurs.

In column (1), the six highest ranking occupations preferred by mothers are (in order of decreasing preference): doctor, businessman, lawyer, college professor, scientists, and profesional athlete. Students, on the other hand, rank as their first six occupational preferences (also in order of decreasing preference as seen in column (6)): professional athlete, lawyer, doctor, businessman, scientist, and electrician. Mothers and students, therefore, agree on five out of their first six occupations; this reveals a high degree of congruence between the value hierarchies of students and parents. The largest discrepancies between adults and students occur in their ranking of "college professor" and "professional athlete." Students value college professor much less ("-5") than mothers, while they value professional athlete much more ("+5") than mothers. Nevertheless, a high degree of value consensus between parents and students is evident in their agreement on five out of the six highest ranking occupations.

With respect to the particular Coleman occupation categories, we see in column (6) that although the occupations have been increased from four to fourteen, the athlete is still selected most frequently by students. The scientist ranks fifth, the airplane pilot ranks seventh, and the missionary, twelfth. Thus the relative rank-ordering of these four occupations to one another remains substantially the same as in Coleman's study, except that the scientist and pilot now switch positions in the rankings.

Inspection of column (7) reveals that the mothers' rank-ordering of the fourteen occupations differ only slightly from the students' rank-ordering. There is no discrepancy larger than five rank positions; there are only two of these ("college professor" and "professional athlete"). Most of the differences are either "-2" or "+1." Similarly, in column (8), the rank ordering by conformists does not radically differ from that of retreatists. For example, retreatists rank athlete three positions higher than conformists, but rank doctor two positions lower than conformists.

The asterisks in columns (7) and (8) indicate -- when there is a discrepancy between the figures in column (7) and (8) -- which column has the larger discrepancy. Ideally, for the degree of value dissensus among adolescents to be equal to the dissensus between adults and adolescents, the same figures should occur in both columns (7) and (8) for each of the fourteen occupations. For example, "electrician" is ranked by students one position higher ("+1") than mothers rank it; and this occupation is also ranked by retreatists one position higher than conformists rank it. A-not-so-ideal situation, however, occurs in the comparative rankings of "garage mechanic." While there is no difference ("0") in the rank-order between students and parents (they both assign it a rank position of eight), retreatists rank "mechanic" four positions higher than conformists. With respect to the ranking of "garage mechanic," therefore, there is greater dissensus among students than between parents and students. Consequently, the asterisk is assigned to the "+4" in column (8) to denote this larger discrepancy. But since there is an equal total number of asterisks (four) in both columns (7) and (8), the total number of discrepancies between adolescents and parents can be said to be equal to the total number of discrepancies occurring among adolescents. We can conclude, therefore, that the degree of value dissensus between adolescents and their parents is equal to the degree of value dissensus among adolescents. These findings make necessary a number of respecifications in Coleman's description of the adolescent subculture:

First of all, the values of adolescents are not in sharp conflict with those of their parents. Our analysis reveals that, for the most part, there is a high degree of congruence between the value hierarchies of parents and adolescents. Thus parents should be considered to be effective socializing agents for transmitting the dominant values of their society to even their adolescent children. Furthermore, our findings reveal that there is as much value conflict among adolescents as there is between adults and adolescents.

Secondly, the question arises, "Who constitutes the adolescent subculture?" If by subculture, Coleman is referring to a high degree of shared values then, properly speaking, retreatists and conformists should not be considered as part of the same subculture. If conformists and retreatists, however, are considered to be part of the same subculture, then a sharp value conflict can no longer be posited between adults and adolescents because conformists and parents have more values in common than conformists and retreatists. One can speak of either (1) a "retreatist" subculture which is oriented toward the goal of social success, or (2) a "conformist" subculture that is oriented toward the goal of academic success. But this leaves us with at least two adolescent subcultures, not one. The conflicting values of these two competing minority subcultures cause the "average" students, the innovators, to experience a high degree of ambivalence. From this ambivalence emerges a value system that assigns equal importance to academic and social values.

Consequently, we suggest that Coleman's description of the adolescent society be modified to indicate the presence of three distinct adolescent subgroups: (1) an academically-oriented group which consists of conformists and ritualists; (2) a socially-oriented crowd consisting primarily of retreatists; and (3) an academically-socially-oriented group consisting primarily of innovators. And the latter should be seen as the group that sets an "ambivalent" tone to the value-orientation of students, in general.[20] Coleman's description of the adolescent society more aptly denotes an adolescent subculture consisting primarily of retreatists.

In sum, we have seen in this chapter that peer group influence, and, more specifically, peer group status is an important determinant of cheating behavior. And that the differential involvement of students in various activities can either enhance or reduce their chances of gaining popularity or of becoming members of the leading crowd. Conformists and ritualists have an academic orientation that conflicts with the social orientation of retreatists. In the middle are the innovators who are oriented to both of these conflicting goals. They seek status among their peers by participating heavily in social activities, yet they also value good grades; in order to "budget" enough time to both pursuits, they are forced to resort to cheating. This explains why the greatest pressure for cheating is exerted upon the innovators.[21]

As a result, the pressures for deviance that are exerted upon students who are innovators come from the conflicting norms among adolescents as well as from the conflicting norms between adults and adolescents. The introduction of the concept role type permitted us to demonstrate that the degree of value dissensus among adolescents is just as great as that between adolescents and their parents. Coleman's thesis of the adolescent subculture was respecified to indicate the presence of three distinct adolescent subgroups: an academically-oriented group, a socially-oriented group, and an academically-socially oriented group.

In the succeeding chapters, ambivalence as a major source of high rates of cheating behavior among students will be a recurring theme.[22] In the next chapter, we will examine the interactional effects of individual and collectivity attributes on peer group associations.

Footnotes

1. Seymour Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959).

2. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961).

3. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

4. Stuart A. Queen, "Foreword," in C. Wayne Gordon, The Social System of the High School, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. viii.

5. Dorwin Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.) Group Dynamics, (Evanston; Illinois: Row Peterson, 1962); Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 421-436.

6. Lipset and Bendix, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

7. Merton, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 140-153.

9. It will be recalled that in the chapter where the typology of role types was validated, we had to specify Merton's hypotheses concerning the relative size of the role types on similar grounds.

10. Coleman, *op. cit.*, Chapter V.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 39, 164.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

17. This is, of course, an elliptical statement since even these role types are committed to both academic and social values. But the degree of conflict among conformists and retreatists is minimized by their capacity to give priority to one of these goals. Innovators, however, assign equal importance to both values.

18. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

19. There is one exception, the occupation "factory worker" was on the students' list, but not on the mothers'; while "elevator operator" was on the mothers' list but not on the students' form. Thus, inadvertently, these occupations were substituted for one another. Fortunately, however, this error does not affect our final results, as shall be seen shortly.

20. Coleman, it should be noted, only discusses the question of ambivalence in the adolescent subculture in terms of the orientation of girls to academic and social goals. See especially Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

21. In his theory of role strain, Goode describes the processes by which role allocation decisions are made as a means of reducing role strain. William J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," *American Sociological Review*, XXV, (August, 1960), pp. 483-496.

22. See Merton's penetrating analysis of situations involving conflicting norms in his examination of ambivalent behavior among scientists. He notes how scientists are torn between the value of humility and that of priority in discovery. Robert K. Merton, "The Ambivalence of Scientists," *The Dynamics of Modern Society*, (ed.) William J. Goode, (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), pp. 282-297.

CHAPTER NINE

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

Our aim in the preceding two chapters was to demonstrate that differential patterns of association in the adolescent peer group was an important determinant of student role adaptations and rates of cheating behavior. Students associating with peers who were overinvolved in studies and extra-curricular activities were found to cheat less often than students whose friends over-participated in athletics or dates and parties. Perceived peer group disapproval was found to have a greater impact on cheating behavior than personal disapproval. In general, students occupying positions of high status among their peers, either as a leading crowd member or as "more" popular, were found to cheat more often than those students holding positions of low status in the peer group. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the intense pressure for cheating exerted upon innovators was a direct outgrowth of their ambivalent orientation to the conflicting goals of conformists and retreatists. In short, the normative conflict within the adolescent society was shown to account for much and, perhaps, most of the role conflict experienced by innovators than did the traditional normative conflict between parents and adolescents.

Thus, the emphases of those chapters have been on the impact of peer group influence on student deviant behavior. In this chapter, however, the focus will be on the social sources of peer group influence. In particular, we will attempt to specify the social determinants of three peer group factors: peer group norms of disapproval, peer group patterns of association, and peer group status. We will restrict this analysis to an examination of the effect of (1) family social class position and (2) community size on these peer group variables.

Peer Group Disapproval Norms

Numerous investigators have observed that the norms and values of young people reflect, for the most part, the norms and values of their family's social class position. It has also been pointed out that often it is the peer group that performs the function of transmitting these class values:

> Perhaps the foremost function of the peer group, however, is to teach the culture of the wider society of which it is part.
>
> While a peer group may be said to have a subculture that is particularly its own, it nevertheless reflects the adult society and reinforces most of the values held by the adult society. . . .
>
> The peer group teaches also the adult subculture of which it is a part. . . . A child who grows up in the slums of Chicago associates with other lower-class boys and girls; he learns from them as well as from his family, the lower-class way of life. The same is true of a child in the middle and upper class. In most cases, the peer group acts to reinforce as well as to elaborate the teaching of the family in directing the child into his society and into a given social class position in the society.[1]

Consequently, we would expect the norms of our students to vary with their social class position. And since we found (in chapter IV) that high income students cheat less frequently than low income students, it can be hypothesized that high income students are more likely to perceive strong peer disapproval of cheating than low income students.

But since we found (in chapter VI) that cheating rate varied with type of community, we would also expect the degree of peer group disapproval to be affected by community size. Because the highest rates of cheating occurred in small towns and suburbs, it might be expected that students living in these communities would be more tolerant of cheating than students living in cities and rural communities. Thus social class may be expected to have its weakest impact on peer group norms of disapproval in the small towns and suburbs. To test these suppositions, we will relate both family income and community size to perceived peer group disapproval of cheating. Before doing this, however, let us first examine the income distribution of our students according to community size.

The data in Table IX.1 reveals that the suburbs have the largest proportion (34%) of students coming from high income families while the city and rural communities have the largest proportions (42% and 39%, respectively) of low-income students. Middle-income students, however, are more likely to come from the small towns (60%) or suburbs (54%) than from cities or rural areas. Since we found (in chapter V) that the greatest pressures for cheating were found among the middle strata, it is now evident why the small towns and suburbs exhibit the highest rates of cheating: they are "middle-income" communities. Now we can return to the question raised earlier, "Is the effect of social class on peer group disapproval norms weakest in the small towns and suburbs?"

TABLE IX.1

FAMILY INCOME BY COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Family Income (in $1,000's)			N
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	13%	45%	42%	(124)
Suburbs	34	54	12	(149)
Small Towns	11	60	29	(66)
Rural	15	46	39	(39)

TABLE IX.2

PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL BY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent "Very" or "Fairly" Strong Peer Disapproval			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income (in $1,000's)			
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	63% (16)	37% (52)	37% (49)	-26%
Suburbs	50 (48)	32 (81)	17 (18)	-33%
Small Towns	43 (7)	28 (40)	16 (19)	-27%
Rural	50 (6)	56 (18)	33 (15)	-17%

Interestingly, we find in Table IX.2 that the impact of social class on peer group disapproval norms is not weakened in the small towns and suburbs; in fact, family income has its greatest effect on peer norms in these communities. For example, 17 per cent of the low-income students living in suburbs perceive their peers as strongly disapproving of cheating, but almost three times that many (50%) students coming from its high income families perceive strong disapproval from their peers. Similarly, in the small towns there is a 27% difference in the proportions of low- and high-income students perceiving strong peer group disapproval of cheating.

An inspection of the column percentages, however, reveals that -- within every income level -- the suburbs and small towns have the smallest proportions of students perceiving strong peer group disapproval of cheating. Among the medium income students, for example, 56 per cent of those living in rural areas perceive strong peer disapproval, but only 28 per cent of those living in small towns and 32 per cent of those living in suburbs perceive strong peer group disapproval. The difference in the perception of peer disapproval between the communities is even larger among the low income students. Only 16 per cent and 17 per cent of the students living in small towns and suburbs, respectively, perceive strong peer disapproval, but twice that many living in rural areas (33%) and cities (37%) perceive strong peer disapproval of cheating.

Consequently, we find that the greatest tolerance of cheating indeed exists in the two community types with the highest cheating rates, the suburbs and small towns. The intense pressure for cheating in these communities, however, does not reduce the effect of social class on peer group norms of disapproval. High income students are more likely to perceive strong disapproval norms against cheating among their peers than low income students -- regardless of the size of the community in which they reside. In short, tolerance of deviance varies with social class: the lower the social class, the more permissive the norms toward deviant behavior.

Often it is assumed that, because the lower class tend to be more permissive of deviant behavior than the middle or upper-class, the rates of deviance are highest among the lower class. Yet (as was demonstrated in chapter V), the highest rates of cheating are to be found among the middle, not the low income strata -- despite the stronger normative disapproval of cheating among the middle class. Thus, because a linear relationship has been found between social class and tolerance of deviance, the assumption that a linear relationship also exists between social class and rates of deviance is not always justified.[2]

Now that we have found community size and family income to be important sources of adolescent norms against cheating, let us examine the effect of these factors on different patterns of peer group associations.

Peer Group Associations

That students are more likely to associate with peers from the same or higher class levels rather than with those from lower social classes has been confirmed by many investigators. Havighurst and Neugarten have noted in this connection:

> The first study of social-class differences in the child's society was made in Jonesville. There Neugarten found that fifth- and sixth-grade children (all of whom were together in the same school), when asked who were their best friends, most often named children above them in social class, then, second, children from their own social class. . . . Among tenth- and eleventh-graders in Jonesville, social-class differences were also clearly operative, but in somewhat more complex ways. Here, when a large proportion of lower-class children had already dropped out of school, adolescents also chose upward or horizontally on the social scale, but seldom downward, in selecting their friends.[3]

Hollingshead, in studying adolescents in Elmtown, found that clique relationships reflected the social class position of the adolescents' families. Three out of five clique relationships were within single social classes; and only one of twenty-five crossed more than one social-class line. He also found that dating patterns clearly followed social class lines.[4] Stendler, studying the children of Brasstown, also found peer group relationships to be class homogeneous.[5]

Consequently, this class homogeneity of peer group relationships may account for the strong effect of peer group activities on cheating. Low cheating rates may result from an overemphasis on studies and extra-curricular activities because high income students participate more often in them than low income students.

The data in Table IX.3 clearly reveal strong class differentials of participation in peer group activities. While 13 per cent of the low income students stress studies, more than three times that many (42%) high income

TABLE IX.3

PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS BY FAMILY INCOME

Family Income (in $1,000's)	Peer Group Associations				N
	Per Cent Participating "More" in:				
	Studies	Extra-Curricular	Athletics	Dates, Parties	
High ($15+)	42%	33%	34%	19%	(76)[a]
Medium ($6-14)	28	25	23	17	(192)
Low (Under $6)	13	16	24	13	(102)
Per Cent Difference	-29%	-17%	-10%	-6%	

[a] Each of the four activities are based on these figures. Thus, the sum of percentages can either be greater or less than 100%.

studies emphasize studies. Similarly, 16 per cent of the low income students participate "more" in extra-curricular activities, but twice as many (33%) high income students participate "more" in these activities. In fact, for all four activities involved, the participation of high income students is greater than that of middle or low income students. But, it should be noted, the social differences in participation decrease from 29 per cent to 6 per cent as one moves from studies to dates and parties. For while 13 per cent of the low income students emphasize dating and parties, only 19 per cent of the high income students overparticipate in dating.

And, despite the "anti-educational" orientation that adolescents are alleged to have, it is important to note that most (that is, both middle and high income) students participate in studies and not in social activities. For example, 19 per cent of the high income students emphasize dating, but

42 per cent of them stress studies. Similarly, 17 per cent of the medium income students participate "more" in dating, but 28 per cent overemphasize studies. Low income students are the only ones that participate more in a social activity than in studies; 13 per cent of them overemphasize studies, but 24 per cent of them overparticipate in athletics.

We find, consequently, that although participation in peer group activities increases with social class, the class differentials are less for athletics and dating than for studies and extra-curricular activities. And, while low income students participate most in athletics, middle and high income students participate most in studies. Thus students participating more in studies and extra-curricular activities are more likely to associate with high income peers than students participating more in sports and dating. We shall now examine the effect of community size on these peer group activities.

TABLE IX.4

PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS BY COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Peer Group Associations Per Cent Participating "More" in: Studies	Extra-Curricular	Athletics	Dates, Parties	N
City	31%	31%	24%	14%	(119)[a]
Suburbs	23	17	24	19	(146)
Small Towns	30	29	33	17	(66)
Rural	26	18	21	10	(39)
Per Cent Difference	-5%	-13%	-3%	-4%	

[a] Each of these four activities are based on these figures. Thus the sum of the percentages can either be greater or less than 100%.

For the most part, there is little difference in the degree of participation in peer group activities of students from different communities (see Table IX.4). For example, while 26 per cent of the students from rural areas emphasize studies, 31 per cent of those from the city stress studies. Nevertheless, one can conclude: (1) that students from cities participate most in studies and extra-curricular activities; (2) that students from suburbs and small towns participate most in studies and athletics; and (3) that those coming from rural areas participate most in studies. The suburbs and small towns, it should be noted, have an "ambivalent" orientation: both studies and athletics are participated in to about the same degree. Furthermore, small towns, which was found to have the highest rates of cheating have the highest proportion of students participating more in athletics.

Consequently, we find that students coming from different kinds of communities tend to differentially emphasize various peer group activities. Since studies was the one activity in which the highest proportion of students participated more in, we shall now observe the interactional effects of community size and family income on degree of participation in this activity.

Looking first at the row percentages in Table IX.5 we find, again that -- no matter what the community size -- participation in studies increases with students' family income. This is particularly true of students living in cities; while 8 per cent of the city dwellers with low income participate more in studies, seven times that many (56%) high income students living in the city overemphasize studies. Similar relationships hold for the remaining communities. On the whole, however, the city and small towns stress studies more than the suburbs and rural communities. Thus social

TABLE IX.5

STUDIES BY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent Participating "More" in Studies			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income (in $1,000's)			
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	56% (16)	43% (53)	8% (49)	-48%
Suburbs	38 (47)	15 (81)	17 (18)	-21%
Small Towns	43 (7)	33 (40)	21 (19)	-22%
Rural	33 (6)	33 (18)	13 (15)	-20%
Per Cent Difference	-23%	-10%	+5%	

class is strongly related to participation regardless of the community size. This is not the case, however, when it comes to participation in dating and parties.

TABLE IX.6

DATES, PARTIES BY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent Participating "More" in Dates and Parties			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income (in $1,000's)			
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	13% (16)	17% (52)	12% (50)	-1%
Suburbs	22 (46)	17 (81)	17 (18)	-5%
Small Town	29 (7)	18 (40)	11 (19)	-18%
Rural	0 (6)	11 (18)	13 (15)	+13%
Per Cent Difference	-13%	-6%	+1%	

In the city and suburbs, social class has almost no effect on the degree of participation in dating (as indicated in Table IX.6). While 12 per cent of the low income city residents stress dating, 13 per cent of the high income students living there also emphasize dating. And in the rural community, social class is inversely related to participation in dating and parties; none of the high income students in that community participate more in dating, while 13 per cent of the low income students participate more in this activity. It is only in the small towns that social class has its strongest effect on participation in dating and parties; only about one-tenth of its low income students stress this activity, but almost three times that many (29%) of its high income students over-participate in dating. Thus the effect of social class on participation in peer group activities varies with the type of activity and type of community involved.

In both of the preceding tables it should be noted that small towns exhibited one of the highest degrees of participation in studies, as well as in dating. Thus there appears to be strong pressures on students coming from the small towns to be "all-around." This leads, consequently, to an ambivalent orientation that highly evaluates academic and social values; this ambivalence, in turn, leads to high rates of cheating. It is now easy to understand why innovators are most often recruited from the small towns.

Peer Group Status

Community size and social class (as measured by family income) have been shown to be important sources of both peer group norms and peer group associations. Our aim will now be to determine the extent to which these factors affect status in the adolescent peer group.

Many of the studies that were cited earlier in this chapter, like the investigations of Jonesville, Brasstown, and Elmtown, found that students from high social class backgrounds were more likely to hold positions of high status among their peers than students from low social class backgrounds.[6]

Using parental education as his measure of social class, Coleman found that students with college-educated parents more often held "elite" positions than students with non-college educated parents:

> These graphs show, for all four elite groups and for both boys and girls, that the elites have college-educated parents more often than do non-elites, and that they less often have parents with only a grade-school education. The effect appears to be greatest for the girls. That is, if a girl's father had no more than a grade-school education, she is not at all likely to be looked up to as an exemplar or thought of as a member of the leading crowd -- or even as a "local" leader in her group of friends.[7]

Therefore, we would expect members of the leading crowd and more popular students to come from high social class backgrounds more often than non-members of the leading crowd and less popular students.

TABLE IX.7

PEER GROUP STATUS BY FAMILY INCOME

Family Income (in $1,000's)	Popularity (Per Cent "More")	Family Income (in $1,000's)	Membership in Leading Crowd (Per Cent "Yes")
High ($15+)	13% (77)	High ($15+)	60% (62)
Medium ($6-14)	8 (192)	Medium ($6-14)	54 (144)
Low (Under $6)	8 (102)	Low (Under $6)	39 (78)
Per Cent Difference	-5%	Per Cent Difference	-21%

The data in Table IX.7 confirm these expectations. While 8 per cent of the low income students see themselves as "more" popular than others, 13 per cent of the high income students see themselves in this manner. With respect to leading crowd membership, the effect of social class is much larger. Sixty per cent of the high income students consider themselves to be members of the leading crowd, but only 39 per cent of the low income students assert that they are leading crowd members. Thus our findings concur with those of Hollingshead and Coleman: the status that students hold among their peers reflect, in large measure, the status that their families hold in the community. But before drawing this conclusion, let us first determine whether social class has this effect on peer group status regardless of the type of community that the students reside in.

TABLE IX.8

POPULARITY BY FAMILY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent "More" Popular Than Others			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income (in $1,000's)			
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	13% (16)	9% (53)	10% (50)	-3%
Suburbs	13 (48)	10 (81)	6 (18)	-7%
Small Towns	29 (7)	5 (40)	5 (19)	-24%
Rural	0 (6)	6 (18)	7 (15)	+7%

Table IX.8 reveals that the importance of social class for peer group status varies radically with community size. In the city, income has virtually no affect on students' popularity; 13 per cent of the high income urban residents see themselves as more popular, but 10 per cent of the low income students also see themselves this way. Social class is more important for popularity in the suburbs than in the city, but the effect is not that much greater. It is only in the small towns that social class really makes a difference in the students' peer group popularity. For 29 per cent of the high income students living in small towns say that they are more popular, but only 5 per cent of the low income students living there see themselves as more popular. On the other hand, in the rural community, the effect of social class is reversed; low income students are more likely to see themselves as more popular than are high income students living there. For example, 7 per cent of the low income students living in the rural area consider themselves to be more popular, but none of the high income students living there see themselves this way.

These findings explain why Hollingshead found such a strong social class impact on the peer group status of high school students in Elmtown. Since Elmtown is a small-town, the effect of social class on popularity might be expected to be greatest there. Coleman, however, did not find social class to be an important determinant of peer group status in Elmtown in his study of the adolescent society in ten Midwestern high schools. The difference in the findings between the two studies results, as Coleman states, from the fact that Hollingshead studied Elmtown in 1940 when it had a high proportion of middle class students; but when Coleman studied the school in 1957, the large proportion of working-class students there dominated the leadership of the school.

At any rate, the effect of social class on student popularity is greater for those living in small towns than in any of the other communities.

We shall now see whether similar findings result when we examine the effect of social class on leading crowd membership in the various community contexts.

TABLE IX.9

LEADING CROWD MEMBERSHIP BY FAMILY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Size	Per Cent "Yes" Member of Leading Crowd			Per Cent Difference
	Family Income (in $1,000's)			
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
City	79% (14)	53% (36)	29% (35)	-50%
Suburbs	51 (37)	47 (55)	62 (13)	+11%
Small Towns	83 (6)	58 (36)	24 (17)	-59%
Rural	40 (5)	71 (17)	62 (13)	+22%

The results in Table IX.9 demonstrate that community type clearly specifies the effect of social class on leading crowd membership. Once again, however, we find that social class has the greatest impact on peer group status in the small town; about one-fourth (24%) of its low income students see themselves as belonging to the leading crowd, but more than three-fourths (83%) of its high income students claim leading crowd membership. A similar strong relationship holds in the city; 29 per cent of the low income students say they are leading crowd members, but 79 per cent of the high income students there see themselves as belonging to the leading crowd.

On the other hand, in the suburbs and rural communities, the effect of social class is reversed. In both communities, a higher proportion of low income students claim leading crowd membership than high income students.

We can therefore conclude: (1) that in small towns social class is a strong determinant of both student popularity and leading crowd membership; (2) in the city, while social class fails to determine popularity, it does have a strong effect on the students' chances of belonging to the leading crowd; (3) in the rural area, social class is inversely related to popularity and leading crowd membership; and (4) in the suburbs, social class has a slight, positive relationship with popularity, but a negative relationship with membership in the leading crowd.

In sum, we have found in this chapter that suburbs and small towns tend to be middle-class, while the city and rural communities tend to be working-class. In every community type, the degree of perceived peer disapproval of cheating increased with social class. However, it was observed that while middle-class students disapproved of cheating more strongly than did lower class students, middle-class students exhibited higher cheating rates.

Participation in peer group activities was found to increase with an increase in social class position of the students. This relationship remained strong even when community size was held constant. Participation in dating and parties, however, was found not to be determined by social class.

In general, students' chances for popularity and leading crowd membership increased with social class position. But when community size was held constant, social class was found to have its strongest impact on peer group status in the small towns. And, in the cities social class determined leading crowd membership, but not popularity. In the suburbs and rural communities, however, the students' chances for leading crowd membership increased the lower the students' social class.

This concludes our assessment of the social determinants of peer group influence. In the next chapter, we will describe the interaction effects of social context, peer group associations, and role adaptations on rates of cheating behavior.

Footnotes

1. Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten, Society and Education, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), pp. 129-130, 131.

2. Rodman's concept of "the lower-class value stretch" is one example of this assumption. See Hyman Rodman, "The Lower-Class Value Stretch," Social Forces, XLII (December, 1963), pp. 205-215; Hyman Rodman, "Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure," American Sociological Review, XXXI (October, 1966), pp. 673-683.

3. Havighurst and Neugarten, op. cit., p. 139.

4. August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949).

5. Celia Burns Stendler, Children of Brasstown, (Urbania: Bureau of Research and Service of the College of Education, University of Illinois, 1949).

6. Havighurst and Neugarten, op. cit., pp. 137-142.

7. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), pp. 252-254.

CHAPTER TEN

SOCIAL CONTEXT, PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS, AND DEVIANCE

Up to this point, the effects of family influence, social context, and peer group associations on role adaptations and deviant behavior have been examined independently of one another. This chapter, however, will consider the interaction effects of these factors in various combinations; consequently, this discussion will be divided into three sections.

The first section will consider the combined effect of social context and family influence on rates of cheating. More specifically, we will be interested in determining whether family income, students' grades, and I.Q. affect cheating behavior regardless of the community setting. This analysis will permit us to draw inferences about the degree to which the source of adolescent deviance can be traced to a lower-class home environment or student lack of ability as opposed to a particular community environment.

In the second section, we will observe the interaction of family influence and peer group associations on cheating. Here, we will be concerned with determining whether adolescents exhibit deviant behavior because of their social class or because of the kinds of peers that they associate with. The kind of question that we will focus upon in this section is: Do high income students whose close friends participate a lot in dating and parties cheat as often as low income students with similar associates? In short, does social class have any effect on deviance rates when peer group associations are held constant? Similarly, an effort will be made to examine the impact of social class and student ability on cheating behavior when perceived peer group norms of disapproval are controlled for. This will allow us to observe, for example, whether students--regardless of their family income--have similar low rates of cheating when they perceive "very strong" disapproval of cheating from their close friends.

In the third and final section of this chapter, we will make an empirical test of the model of deviance (as described in Chapter Two) that incorporates Merton's theoretical conception of anomie with Sutherland's theory of differential association. We will, therefore, examine the interaction of social context and peer group associations on cheating behavior; and because role adaptations is an important intervening variable in our theoretical model, we will also consider the combined effects of social context, peer group associations, and role adaptations on rates of cheating. This analysis will entail, for example, an assessment of the relative impact of individual role adaptations as opposed to group (that is, classroom) adaptations when peer group associations are held constant. One of the questions for which we will seek an answer in this section is: Among students associating with peers that overemphasize studies, do conformists that are situated in "deviant-oriented" (that is, with a small proportion of conformists) classrooms cheat more frequently or less frequently than deviants that are situated in "conformist-oriented" (that is, with a large proportion of conformists) contexts?

Social Context and Family Influence

Numerous investigations have confirmed the existence of a strong relationship between community context and social class; although recently more attention has been drawn to urban-suburban differences, most of the focus has been on urban-rural differences. As was pointed out in Chapter Six, for example, Lipset and Bendix found educational opportunities to be greater in urban than rural environments.

Natalie Rogoff discusses the importance of the community context in terms of its differential social class distributions:

> ...let it be granted that the various social classes are not randomly distributed among the diverse sizes and types of communities in the U.S. today...It follows that each of the social classes will be more heavily concentrated in some kinds of community environments than in others, and that communities will vary in the predominant or average social class affiliation of their residence. Such situational differences may set in motion both formal arrangements--such as school, library, and general cultural facilities in the community--and informal mechanisms, such as normative climates or modal levels of social aspiration, which are likely to affect all members of the community to some extent--parents and children, upper, middle, and working classes.[1]

In the preceding chapter, we observed that the small town and suburban community types had the highest proportions of middle-income students, while the urban and rural communities had the highest proportions of low-income students. We also found in that chapter that the city and small town had the highest proportions of students overemphasizing studies. Consequently, it is expected that the highest degree of scholastic achievement will be exhibited by students living in the city and small town.

TABLE X.1

GRADES BY FAMILY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT WITH GRADES OF B OR HIGHER)

Size of Community	Family Income (in $1,000's			
	High ($15)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	Marginals
City	94% (16)	62% (55)	21% (52)	49% (123)
Suburbs	61 (49)	38 (81)	44 (18)	47 (148)
Small Towns	57 (7)	59 (39)	58 (19)	59 (65)
Rural	17 (6)	39 (18)	17 (12)	28 (36)
Per Cent Diff.	-77%	-23%	- 4%	-21%

The marginals in Table X.1 indicate that the city and small town do have the highest proportions of students receiving high grades; 59 per cent of the small town students have grades of B or higher, for example, while only 28 per cent of the rural students have these grades; the city, on the other hand, has 49 per cent of its students with B or higher grades.

When students' family income is held constant, however, the city has the largest proportions of high and middle income students receiving grades of B or higher. Fifty-seven per cent of the high income students living in the small town have B or higher grades, but almost 100% (94 per cent, in fact) of the high income students in the city have these grades. Similarly, while 59 per cent of the middle-income small town students receive high grades, 62 per cent of the middle-income students from the city also receive high grades. Among the low income students, however, those from the small town receive the highest grades, while those from the urban and rural communities receive the lowest grades.

The row percentages show that the small town is the only community context in which income has no effect upon grades; while 57 per cent of the high income students living there receive B or higher grades, 58 per cent of the low income small town students obtain these grades--a difference of only one per cent. In the city, on the other hand, there is a 73 per cent difference between its high (94 per cent) and low income (21 per cent) students' grades.

These findings strongly support our description (in the preceding chapter) of the small town as having an "ambivalent" orientation and as having the greatest pressures upon its students to be "all-around." Not only does the small town have the highest proportion of students participating in sports, but it also has the largest proportion of students receiving high grades. And we have found that low income students in small towns are just as likely to receive high grades as the high income students; thus there is intense pressure upon all students--regardless of their social class--to perform well academically in small towns. But high and middle income students have their best chances for obtaining high grades when they reside in the city.

Our results strongly concur with those of Coleman; for the high schools that he found to have the highest degree of scholastic achievement also were located in a small town and a small city. The small town was Marketville with a population of 4,000 and the small city was Midcity with a population of 100,000.[2] (It should be recalled that our city also has an estimated 1960 population of 100,000, while our two small towns have populations of 4,000 and 6,000.)

We felt it was necessary to present the distribution of the grades of the different income categories within each community (as was done in Table X.1) in order to demonstrate that the high cheating rates exhibited in the small towns (as seen in Table X.2) is not a consequence of low grades.

TABLE X.2

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Size of Community	Family Income (in $1,000's) High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	Per Cent Difference
City	25% (16)	40% (53)	48% (50)	+ 23%
Suburbs	40 (48)	62 (81)	72 (18)	+ 32%
Small Towns	71 (7)	73 (40)	53 (19)	- 18%
Rural	17 (6)	41 (17)	53 (15)	+ 36%

Table X.2 shows that a strong inverse relationship exists between family income and cheating rates in the urban, suburban and rural communities; for example, 40 per cent of the high income suburban students cheat, but 72 per cent of the low income suburban students cheat. Similarly, in the city one-fourth of its high income students cheat, but one-half of its low income students cheat; and the difference in the cheating rates between these two income categories in the rural area is 36 per cent.

In the small town, however, not only does income have its smallest effect on cheating, but the relationship is a positive one. Slightly more than half (53 per cent) of the low income small town students cheat, but almost three-fourths (71 per cent) of its high income students cheat; in short, this indicates that--in the small town--pressures for cheating apparently increase with social class position. In the other types of communities, however, these pressures tend to decrease with an increase in social class. That there is greater pressure for cheating on the "better" students in the small town than in any other community type is also demonstrated when cheating is related to grades in different community contexts (as shown in Table X.3).

TABLE X.3

CHEATING BY GRADES AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Size of Community	Students' Grades			Per Cent Difference
	A or B	C	D or F	
City	29% (68)	44% (55)	44% (32)	+15%
Suburbs	52 (79)	64 (70)	62 (50)	+10%
Small Towns	62 (55)	61 (33)	55 (11)	- 7%
Rural	27 (11)	38 (21)	54 (13)	+27%

Once again, we find the small town to be the "deviant" case; while cheating rates decrease as grades increase in the urban, suburban, and rural communities, they increase with grades in the small town. In the city, for example, the cheating rate ff the "D or F" students is 15 per cent higher than the cheating rate of the "A or B" students; but in the small town the cheating rate among the "D or F" students is 7 per cent lower than the rate for the students with grades of B or higher.

It should also be noted that in the suburbs and small towns the cheating rates of the "C" students are higher than the cheating rates of the students with grades of D or less. Thus there appears to be greater pressure for cheating on the "average" students in the suburb and small town than on the "below-average" students. Similar curvilinear relationships in the small town and suburb reappear when cheating is related to I.Q. in the different community contexts. (See Table X.4.)

TABLE X.4

CHEATING BY I.Q. AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Size of Community	Students' I.Q.				Per Cent Difference
	121-164	111-120	100-110	61-99	
City	31% (35)	24% (25)	36% (14)	42% (66)	+ 11%
Suburbs	46 (46)	62 (61)	67 (55)	53 (30)	+ 7%
Small Towns	41 (17)	75 (28)	55 (31)	68 (22)	+ 27%
Rural	0	56 (18)	33 (18)	44 (9)	- 12%

Table X.4 shows that ability is not linearly related to cheating rates within most of the communities; for, in the suburbs, small town, and rural communities, a higher proportion of "above-average" I.Q. students (that is, those with I.Q.'s between 111-120) cheat than "below-average" I.Q. students (that is, those having I.Q.'s between 61-99). For example, in the suburbs, 53 percent of the "below-average" I.Q. students cheat, but 62 per cent of the "above-average" I.Q. students cheat. Similarly in the small towns, 68 per cent of the "below-average" I.Q. students cheat, but 75 per cent of the "above-average" I.Q. students cheat. It is only in the city that a linear relationship appears to exist; 24 per cent of the "above-average" I.Q. students cheat, but 42 per cent of the "below-average" I.Q. students cheat.

In this section, therefore, we have found that (1) cheating is negatively related to income in urban, suburban and rural communities, but is positively related to family income in the small town; (2) cheating is also negatively related to grades in urban, suburban, and rural communities, but is positively related to grades in the small town; (3) cheating is negatively related to I.Q. in cities, but is curvilinearly related to I.Q. in the other community contexts; and (4) that cheating pressures appear to be greater for the above-average students in the suburb and small town than for the below-average students there.

Family Influence and Peer Group Influence

Now that we have seen that community context and individual attributes like social class, I.Q., and grades have strong independent effects on cheating, we shall now examine the relative impact of family and peer group influence on cheating behavior. Since perceived peer group disapproval proved to be one of the strongest peer group determinants of cheating, we will examine its effects upon the relationships between cheating and grades, I.Q. and social class.

Bowers assessed the interaction effects of these factors by relating cheating to students' grades (which was his measure of student ability) and perceived peer group disapproval; his results are presented below in Table X.5.

TABLE X.5

CHEATING BY GRADES AND PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL: BOWERS' DATA[a]

(PER CENT CHEATING)

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	College Students' Grade Average: B or Higher	B- or C +	C or Lower	Per Cent Difference
Strong	25% (711)	35% (794)	36% (476)	+ 11%
Moderate	45 (400)	51 (560)	52 (364)	+ 7%
Weak	63 (475)	69 (823)	71 (652)	+ 8%
Per Cent Diff.	+ 38%	+ 34%	+ 35%	

[a] Source: William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964), p.151.

After assessing the relative impact of grades and peer group disapproval on cheating, Bowers concluded that grades had little impact on cheating when peer group disapproval was held constant:

> No matter what the students' grade averages, the level of peer group disapproval strongly affects their likelihood of engaging in academic dishonesty. We might have expected that the disapproval of their peers would have less effect on those who are under pressure to pass courses and to stay in school than on the students who are doing well in their academic work. But Table 8.7 (that is, Table X.5 above) shows that this is not the case. The poor students are almost as sensitive to the disapproval of their peers as are the good students...
>
> In short the power of the peer group is such as to almost nullify the pressures to cheat that arise from students' poor academic performances. Where the peer group condones cheating, even the good students, those who presumably have little reason to cheat, nevertheless do so almost as often as the poor students in the same kind of peer group.[3]

Very similar results were obtained when we related cheating to grades and peer group disapproval, as shown in Table X.6.

TABLE X.6

CHEATING BY GRADES AND PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL: HILL'S DATA

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	Students' H.S. Grades			Per Cent Difference
	A or B	C	D or F	
Very Strong	28% (36)	26% (27)	29% (14)	+ 1%
Fairly Strong	38 (50)	42 (33)	43 (14)	+ 5%
Not Strong	43 (83)	64 (69)	44 (25	+ 1%
Not at all	77 (43)	65 (49)	73 (51)	- 4%
Per Cent Diff.	+ 49%	+ 39%	+ 44%	

We find, as did Bowers, that the cheating behavior of the poorer students is affected by the norms of their peers as much as the behavior of the better students; there is a 49 per cent difference between cheating rates of "A or B" students in the extreme disapproval categories (that is, "very strong" as opposed to "not at all"), but there is a similar difference (44 per cent) between the cheating rates of the "D or F" students in those categories. Furthermore, among those students perceiving no peer disapproval, a higher proportion of the "A or B" students cheat (77 per cent) than the "D or F" students (73 per cent). Thus grades have virtually no effect on cheating when peer group norms are held constant. A slightly different finding results when I.Q. is used instead of grades, as shown in Table X.7.

TABLE X.7

CHEATING BY I.Q. AND PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	Student I.Q.				Per Cent Difference
	121-164	111-120	100-110	61-99	
Very Strong	29% (17)	21% (14)	20% (15)	31% (26)	+ 2%
Fairly Strong	23 (22)	43 (28)	41 (17)	56 (27)	+33%
Not Strong	34 (38)	60 (52)	57 (47)	50 (32)	+24%
Not at all	80 (20)	76 (38)	72 (39)	62 (39)	- 18%
Per Cent Diff.	+ 51%	+ 55%	+ 52%	+ 31%	

Among those students perceiving "fairly strong" or "not strong" peer disapproval, cheating increases as I.Q. level decreases; but among those students who do not perceive any disapproval of cheating from their peers, cheating increases as I.Q. level increases. For example, among the students perceiving "fairly strong" peer disapproval, 56 per cent of the below-average (that is, between 61-99) I.Q. students cheat, but only 23 per cent of the 121-164 I.Q. students cheat. However, among those students perceiving no disapproval, 62 per cent of the 61-99 I.Q. students cheat, but 80 per cent of the 121-164 I.Q. students cheat. And among those perceiving "very strong" disapproval from their peers, the cheating rate of the lowest I.Q. category is about the same as the cheating rate in the highest I.Q. category: the rates are 31 per cent and 29 per cent, respectively. It should also be noted that among those students perceiving "not strong" or "not at all" peer disapproval, students with I.Q.'s between 111-120 cheat more often than students with I.Q.'s between 61-99; thus, once again, we find that the pressure for cheating is greater upon the "above-average" (111-120 I.Q.) I.Q. students than on the "below-average" (with I.Q.'s between 61-99) I.Q. students. These findings clearly indicate that lack of ability (or lack of access to legitimate means) fails to account for the higher cheating rates in these situations.

It is also clear that perceived peer group disapproval is a more powerful determinant of student cheating behavior than ability or grades. Now let us examine the effect of th variable on the relationship between social class and cheating rates.

TABLE X.8

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	Family Income (in $1,000's)			Per Cent Difference
	High $15+	Medium $6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
Very Strong	14% (21)	41% (22)	43% (14)	+ 29%
Fairly Strong	42 (19)	32 (43)	47 (15)	+ 3%
Not Strong	36 (25)	65 (69)	44 (39)	+ 8%
Not at all	75 (12)	66 (56)	76 (33)	+ 1%
Per Cent Diff.	+ 61%	+ 25%	+ 33%	

In the two previous tables, both grades and I.Q. had their weakest effects on the cheating rates of those students who perceived "very strong" disapproval of their peers. But in Table X.8 we find that social class has its strongest impact upon the cheating behavior of those students perceiving "very strong" pper disapproval. Among those perceiving "very strong" disapproval we find, for example, that 43 per cent of the low income students cheat, but only 14 per cent of the high income students cheat. Low income students are sensitive to any disapproval from their peers; for they exhibit the same rates of cheating whether they perceive the disapproval of their peers as "very strong," "fairly strong," or "not strong." It is only when they perceive no disapproval that their cheating rate soars. On the whole, unless the perceived disapproval of peers is "very strong," family income does not have a strong impact on rates of cheating. Thus peer group disapproval proves to be a more powerful determinant of deviance than family income, I.Q., and grades. Our attention will now turn to the relative effects of social class and peer group associations on cheating.

Family Influence and Peer Group Associations

In Chapter Nine, we found strong class differentials to exist in the degree of participation in such peer group activities as studies and extra-curricular activities. High income students are more likely to participate in studies and extra-curricular activities than are low income students; but low income students are just as likely to participate in athletics and dating as are high income students. Since high income students have been shown to cheat less than low income students, we are now interested in observing the combined effects of peer group associations and family influence upon cheating. Do high income students, for example, who associate with peers that underemphasize studies cheat more than low income students whose associates overemphasize studies? The data in Table X.9 indicates that the answer to this question is "Yes."

TABLE X.9

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND PARTICIPATION IN STUDIES

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Participation in Studies	Family Income (in $1,000's)			Per Cent Difference
	High ($15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	
More	25% (32)	38% (53)	31% (13)	+ 6%
Same	49 (39)	63 (120)	54 (74)	+ 5%
Less	40 (5)	67 (18)	79 (14)	+ 39%
Per Cent Diff.	+15%	+ 29%	+ 48%	

For 31 per cent of the low income students associating with peers that participate "more" in studies cheat, but 40 per cent of the high income students whose friends participate "less" in studies cheat. In fact, unless their associates underemphasize studies, there is very little difference between the cheating rates of low and high income students; for among those students whose associates participate "more" in studies 31 per cent of the low income students cheat, but almost as many (25 per cent) high income students also cheat.

The column percentages reveal that degree of participation in studies affects the cheating behavior of low income students more than of high income students. While it accounts for only a difference of 15 per cent in the cheating rates among high income students, participation in studies accounts for a variance of 48 per cent in the cheating rates among low income students. Let us now examine Table X.10 to determine whether another kind of peer group activity--dating and parties--has a similar effect on social class and deviant behavior.

TABLE X.10

CHEATING BY FAMILY INCOME AND PARTICIPATION IN DATES AND PARTIES

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Participation in Dates, Parties	Family Income (in $1,000's) High $15+)	Medium ($6-14)	Low (Under $6)	Difference
Less	35% (20)	47% (51)	47% (30)	+ 12%
Same	34 (41)	55 (107)	56 (59)	+ 22%
More	57 (14)	72 (32)	62 (13)	+ 5%
Per Cent Diff.	+22%	+ 25%	+ 15%	

Holding degree of participation in dating and parties constant, we find that cheating rates tend to increase as income level decreases; while 35 per cent of the high income students with peers that participate "less" in dating cheat, 47 per cent of the low income students with similar associates cheat. Among those students with friends that participate "more" in dating, high income students are just as likely to cheat (57%) as are low income students (62%). And in this group, interestingly, a higher proportion of the medium income students cheat (72 per cent) than low income students (whose cheating rate is 62 per cent).

Thus we have seen in this section that, although social class and peer group associations both have strong independent effects upon cheating, the impact of the latter on cheating behavior appears to be greater.

Social Context and Peer Group Associations

In this the final section, we will, first, examine the relative effects of social context and peer group influence on cheating behavior. Second, we will assess the combined effects of social context, peer group associations, and role adaptations on deviant behavior in order to test our theoretical model that incorporates Merton's theory of anomie with Sutherland's differential association theory.

Because community type and peer group associations are both strongly related to cheating behavior, we are now interested in observing the relative impact of each factor on cheating rates. (See Table X.11).

TABLE X.11

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP ASSOCIATIONS AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT "CHEATED" OF ONLY THOSE PARTICIPATING "MORE" IN:)

Size of Community	Peer Group Associations Studies	 Extra-Curric.	 Athletics	 Dates,Parties	Difference
City	18% (45)	34% (41)	47% (40)	48% (25)	+30%
Suburbs	30 (37)	58 (33)	58 (50)	73 (44)	+43%
Small Towns	52 (29)	55 (31)	68 (34)	77 (13)	+25%
Rural	36 (11)	50 (8)	56 (9)	60 (5)	+25%
Per Cent Difference	+18%	-16%	+9%	+12%	

In every community, the rate of cheating linearly increases the more students participate in such social activities as athletics and dating; in the suburbs, for example, about one-third (30 per cent) of the students who overemphasize studies cheat, but almost three-fourths (73 per cent) of the students who overemphasize dating cheat--a difference of 43 per cent. Similarly, in the city, the difference in the cheating rates between students participating in these two peer activities is 30 per cent.

But the column percentages indicate that--no matter what the activity--the highest rates of cheating are found among the students from the suburbs and small towns. For example, among those students participating "more" in studies, 18 per cent of those living in the city cheat, but almost three times that many (52 per cent) students living in the small towns cheat. Similarly, among those students associating with peers that overparticipate in dating and parties, almost half (48 per cent) of the city students cheat, but more than three-fourths (77 per cent) of those living in small towns cheat. This is further confirmation that pressures for cheating are greater for students living in small towns and suburbs than for students living in urban and rural communities. Thus we have found community size and peer group associations to have strong independent effects upon cheating; in Table X.12 we present the combined effects of peer group disapproval and community size on rates of cheating.

TABLE X.12

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL AND COMMUNITY SIZE

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Perceived Peer Group Disapproval	Size of Community City	 Suburbs	 Small Towns	 Rural
Very Strong	33% (30)	31% (26)	10% (10)	20% (10)
Fairly Strong	32 (31)	44 (41)	47 (17)	38 (8)
Not Strong	36 (56)	59 (71)	64 (36)	53 (17)
Not at all	63 (30)	79 (58)	76 (38)	58 (12)
Per Cent Diff.	+30%	+48%	+66%	+38%

The column percentages in Table X.12 indicate that peer group norms of disapproval have a strong impact on cheating, regardless of the community size. Urban students appear to be the most sensitive to any indication of disapproval from their peers; for even as the perceived peer group disapproval goes from "very strong" and "fairly strong" to "not strong," only one-third of the students continue to cheat. It is only when the students do not perceive any peer disapproval of cheating that the cheating rate in the city takes a sharp rise. And, except for those students perceiving "very strong" peer disapproval, the students from the suburbs and small towns again exhibit the highest cheating rates.

In Chapter Six we showed that peer group disapproval when aggregated as a classroom contextual variable was strongly related to cheating behavior; now we shall examine the independent effects of disapproval as a property of a collectivity with the effects of disapproval as a property of the individual. (See Table X.13.)

TABLE X.13

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL AND CLASSROOM DISAPPROVAL

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Classroom Climate of Peer Group Disapproval	Perceived Peer Group Disapproval				Per Cent Diff.
	Very Strong	Fairly Strong	Not Strong	Not at All	
High Disapproval	30% (47)	35% (65)	45% (102)	65% (43)	+35%
Low Disapproval	23 (31)	52 (33)	62 (78)	74 (103)	+51%
Per Cent Diff.	- 7%	+17%	+17%	+9%	

As might be expected, cheating decreases as the peer group disapproval of the classroom climate increases; among those students perceiving "fairly strong" disapproval from their peers, for example, about one-third (35 per cent) of the students in classrooms with high disapproval climates cheat, but more than one-half (52 per cent) of the students in classrooms with low disapproval climates cheat. Similar relationships hold among those perceiving "not strong" and "not at all" peer disapproval.

Curiously, among those perceiving "very strong" disapproval, the cheating rate goes up as the disapproval of the classroom climate increases; 30 per cent of the students in classrooms with high disapproval climates cheat, but a smaller proportion (23 per cent) of the students in the low disapproval cheat. We are at a loss to explain why this should occur; because we had expected cheating rates to decrease as the classroom climate of disapproval increased.

This strange finding reappears when classroom adaptations are used instead of classroom climate of peer group disapproval, as can be seen in Table X.14.

TABLE X.14

CHEATING BY PEER GROUP DISAPPROVAL AND CLASSROOM ADAPTATIONS

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Classroom Adaptations	Perceived Peer Group Disapproval				Difference
	Very Strong	Fairly Strong	Not Strong	Not at All	
Conformist-Oriented	30% (33)	32% (37)	34% (74)	56% (36)	+26%
Deviant-Oriented	24 (45)	46 (61)	65 (106)	76 (110	+52
Per Cent Diff.	-6%	+14%	+31%	+20%	

Among the students perceiving "very strong" peer disapproval, 24 per cent of those in deviant-oriented classrooms cheat, but a larger proportion (30 per cent) of those in conformist-oriented classrooms cheat. For some strange reason, there appears to be greater pres ures for cheating on students located in conformist-oriented, high disapproval classroom climates than on students located in deviant-oriented, low disapproval classroom climates among those perceiving "very strong" disapproval among their peers.

Among the remaining peer disapproval categories, however, classroom adaptations are positively related to cheating: the more deviant the classroom adaptation, the higher the cheating rate. For while one-third of those perceiving "not strong" peer disapproval in conformist-oriented classrooms cheat, almost twice as many (65%) of those in deviant-oriented classrooms with similar perceptions cheat.

This brings us to the test of the four-variable model suggested by Merton (as described in Chapter Two) that incorporates his theory of anomie with Sutherland's theory of differential association. This model interrelates social context, peer group associations, role adaptations, and deviant behavior. For convenience, we shall combine the three sociologically deviant adaptations (ritualists, innovators and retreatists) so that we can compare the cheating rate of "deviants" with that of conformists. It should be recalled that on the psychological level of the individual, what Merton calls "anomics" we call "deviants" (that is, our three deviant adaptations); and what Merton calls the "non-anomics" we call the "conformists."

On the level of the collectivity, we will use our aggregated variable, classroom adaptations, as an indicator of Merton's anomie (or what we have respecified as "egoism"). And the deviant-oriented classroom climate will be considered as a measure of a high degree of anomie, while the conformist-oriented classroom climate will be considered as a state of low anomie. Using participation in studies as our first measure of peer group associations, we interrelate these four variables in Table X.15 below.

TABLE X.15

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPES, PEER GROUP STUDIES, AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Degree of Participation in Studies	Classroom Adaptations					
	("Low Egoism") Conformist-Oriented			("High Egoism") Deviant-Oriented		
	Conformists	Deviants	Diff.	Conformists	Deviants	Diff.
More	23% (40)	27% (26)	+ 4%	33% (24)	44% (32)	+11%
Same	38 (48)	52 (52)	+14%	52 (58)	68 (160)	+16%
Less	67 (3)	57 (7)	-10%	0 (0)	72 (39)	
Per Cent Diff.	+44%	+30%		+19%	+28%	

First, the column percentages indicate that cheating rates increase the lower the degree of association with peers who emphasize studies. For example, among those students located in conformist-oriented classrooms, 57 per cent of the deviants whose associates participate "less" in studies cheat, but only 27 per cent of the deviants whose associates participate "more" in studies cheat.

Since it is most often assumed that individuals who are conformists do not exhibit deviant behavior, this table serves to remind us that there are a number of situations in which conformists cheat more often than deviants! For example, in the conformist-oriented classrooms, conformists with associates who participate in studies the "same" or "less" than others cheat more frequently (with cheating rates of 38 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively) than deviants with peers who participate "more" in studies (whose cheating rate is only 27 per cent). Or, in the deviant-oriented classroom, conformists with peers who participate in studies the "same as others" cheat more often (52 per cent) than deviants with friends who participate "more" in studies (44 per cent). Thus the role adaptation of conformity should not be equated with the behavior of conformity: although related, they are independent variables.

Table X.15 also reveals that individual role adaptation still has an important, although weakened, effect on cheating rates; while 52 per cent of the conformists in deviant-oriented classrooms whose friends participate in studies the "same as others" cheat, 68 per cent of the deviants in these contexts whose associates similarly participate in studies cheat.

The social context of classroom adaptations also demonstrates its strong impact on cheating behavior in Table X.15. Among those students with peers who participate "more" in studies, 27 per cent of the deviants in conformist-oriented classrooms cheat, but 44 per cent of the deviants in deviant-oriented classrooms cheat. Consequently, social context, peer group associations, and role adaptations each have independent effects upon cheating rates. A similar result occurs when dating is substituted for studies as shown in Table X.16.

TABLE X.16

CHEATING BY ROLE TYPES, DATES AND PARTIES AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

(PER CENT CHEATED)

Degree of Participation in Dates, Parties	Classroom Adaptations					
	("Low Egoism") Conformist-Oriented			("High Egoism") Deviant-Oriented		
	Conformists	Deviants	Diff.	Conformists	Deviants	Diff.
Less	28% (32)	28% (18)	0	39% (26)	62% (60)	+23%
Same	32 (47)	43 (54)	+13%	49 (51)	61 (122)	+12%
More	40 (10)	77 (13)	+37%	50 (6)	77 (51)	+27%
Per Cent Diff.	+12%	+49%		+11%	+15%	

The column percentages in Table X.16 indicate that the more students associate with peers who overemphasize dating, the higher their cheating rates--regardless of the classroom context or the individual role adaptation. For example, in the conformist-oriented classrooms, 28 per cent of the conformists whose friends participate "less" in dating cheat, but 40 per cent of the conformists whose associates participate "more" in dating and parties cheat.

Participation in dating and parties has its strongest effect upon the cheating behavior of deviants in conformist-oriented classrooms; for while 28 per cent of the deviants whose friends participate "less" in dating cheat, 77 per cent of the deviants whose peers participate "more" in dating cheat. Interestingly, among those students in conformist-oriented contexts whose peers participate in dating "less than others," there is no difference in the cheating rates (28 per cent) of conformists and deviants.

Once again, social context demonstrates a strong impact on cheating rates, when the other two factors are held constant. For example, among those students with peers that participate "less" in dating, 28 per cent of the deviants in conformist-oriented classrooms cheat, but more than twice that many (62 per cent) deviants in deviant-oriented classrooms cheat.

These findings (especially those in Table X.16) clearly confirm the hypothetical deviance rates predicted by Merton in his four-variable model of deviance that was described in Chapter Two.[4] Therefore, in order to account for deviant behavior, these three factors must be weighed: social context, peer group associations and individual role adaptations.

In sum, we have found in this chapter that (1) cheating rates varied by community size and social class: they were positively related to family income in the suburbs, but were negatively related to family income in the remaining communities; (2) cheating increased as grades increased among students living in small towns, but they increased with a decrease in grades among students in other communities; (3) greater pressure for cheating appeared to be on "average" or "above-average" students in the small towns and suburbs rather than on the "below-average" students in these two communities; (4) both perceived peer group disapproval and peer group associations had a greater impact on student deviant behavior than family income, although the latter's effect on cheating still remained strong; (5) students in small towns and suburbs were found to cheat more often than students living in other communities--regardless of their degree of participation in peer group activities; (6) rates of cheating increased as the classroom climate of peer group disapproval increased, for each category of peer disapproval except those perceiving "very strong" disapproval from their peers; and (7) social context, peer group associations, and role adaptations were found to have strong independent effects on the rate of cheating behavior.

Consequently, deviant behavior is best explained when the effects of social context, peer group associations,aand role adaptations are simultaneously controlled for in an empirical analysis.

Footnotes

1. Natalie Rogoff, "Local Social Structure and Educational Selection," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Flood, and C. Arnold Anderson (Eds.), Education, Economy, and Society, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 242-243.

2. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 96.

3. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 150-151.

4. Compare our findings with the hypothetical figures presented by Merton in his four-variable paradigm; they clearly confirm his predictions about the relative effects of each dependent variable on deviance rates. See Robert K. Merton, "Anomie, Anomia, and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior," in Marshall B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior, (Glencoe: Free Press, 1964), p. 237.

Chapter XI

Conclusions and Implications

Each of the preceding chapters dealt with a different aspect of the main problem of this study: the social-psychological sources of deviant behavior. This chapter will attempt to integrate the findings from those chapters to permit us to draw relevant implications for future theoretical and empirical analyses of deviance. This will not be, however, a summary of those findings because that has already been done, for the most part, at the conclusion of each chapter. Nor will we make any recommendations concerning devices for social control (such as honor systems or better proctering methods) of cheating in academic settings. In the Introduction to this paper we made it clear that this was not a study of the "problem" of cheating, but a study of the social sources of cheating in various contexts. Furthermore, Bowers' study of cheating among college students rigorously examines the question of social control and academic dishonesty at great length; we, therefore, recommend that this work be read by those interested in that problem.[1]

The one product of this study which we feel has the greatest potential for affecting the direction of future inquiries on deviance is the classification scheme presented on page I-29 at the close of Chapter One. This scheme describes the major components of Durkheim's contexts of anomie, altruism, egoism, and fatalism. Because we anticipate that this model will generate much discussion, we shall make a number of observations about the use of paradigms in general before duscussing this particular one.

The value of qualitative classification schemes as aids in theoretical and empirical analyses has been amply demonstrated in the field of social science.[2] Unfortunately, however, it appears that a "ritualistic" adaptation has developed with respect to paradigms in sociology: once a scheme is presented, a contest ensues to determine who can construct the most elaborate classification, while the purpose for the creation of the original scheme is permitted to recede into the background. (Thus this is not "innovative" adaptation since the innovator always directs his bahavior toward achieving the original goal.)

In point of fact, this is the history of Merton's typology of individual adaptations. Merton created this paradigm to provide one means by which propositions in his middle-range theory of anomie could be empirically verified. But a number of investigators accepted it as a challenge to construct a more sophisticated one; as a rule, this entailed expansion, not contraction of the types. Consequently, fourteen and 25 cell classification schemes were developed -- among others. Original efforts like these are essential to the development of a science; but that science will never develop if its major theories are not empirically tested. Thus innovative, not ritualistic, efforts are needed.

We are not suggesting that Merton's paradigm (or any paradigm, for that matter) should have been accepted without theoretical debate; we are suggesting that if an alternative paradigm is presented, it should be a functional equivalent of the one that is replaced. In this instance, it should be a paradigm that permits the propositions of the theory of anomie to be empirically tested just as well, or even better than Merton's typology. But past experience has demonstrated that a paradigm (or variable) containing 14 or 25 categories is less amenable to empirical analysis than one with 4 or 5 categories.

At the same time, the originator of a new classification scheme should clearly distinguish those components which are definitions from those that are hypotheses. It appears that much of the confusion over Merton's paradigm (or, for that matter, over many sociological issues) is a result of the failure to make this distinction explicit.

Therefore, we will now attempt to make explicit the hypotheses and definitions contained in our classification scheme in Chapter I; but, throughout this discussion, the primary purpose for its creation should be kept uppermost in view. Its main objective is to have social investigators of deviance ask themselves: "Which one of the four social contexts of Durkheim (that is, egoism, altruism, fatalism and anomie) is most appropriate for studying this particular kind of deviant behavior?"

In short, its purpose is to provide social scientists with alternatives to the context of anomie. Whether or not our classification scheme is used is not the issue; but its objective would have been fulfilled if it succeeded in stimulating empirical and theoretical analyses to employ the notion of alternative social contexts in the study of deviant behavior -- even when those analyses are based on other classifications.

We shall now specify the definitions and hypotheses contained in the classification scheme presented on page I-29. Each of the four social contexts are described by five components: A) the psychological equivalent of the concept on the collectivity level; B) the dominant normative pattern for that context; C) the modal deviant adaptation; D) the primary source of deviance within that context; and E) examples of the typical kinds of deviant behavior which occur in that context. Components B and D are both part of the definition of that social context, while components C and E are part of hypotheses that emerge from that definition. Component A is part of a definition and part of a hypothesis. These various components will now be described in detail.

The social context, therefore, is defined by its dominant normative pattern and its primary source of deviance. It is left to the investigator, who after assessing both psychological and sociological factors that he deems necessary, to make the final determination as to what is the "dominant" normative pattern and the "primary" source of deviance in a particular social context. Thus, we have defined Durkheim's four social contexts as follows:

Definition One: Altruism is a social state in which the universalistic-ascription normative pattern is dominant and the primary source of deviance is group allegiance.

Definition Two: Fatalism is a social state in which the particularistic-ascription normative pattern is dominant and the primary source of deviance is oppressive rule.

Definition Three: Anomie is a social state in which either (1) no normative pattern is dominant and the source of deviance is the absence of norms; or (2) a particular normative pattern is dominant, but it is ambiguous or not visible. The source of deviance in this second instance is the ambiguity or unawareness of prevailing norms.

Definition Four: Egoism is a social state in which the universalistic-achievement normative pattern is dominant and the primary source of deviance is normative, role or status conflict.

Definition Five: Altrusia is the psychological feeling of individuals who have strong allegiance to one group above all others.

Definition Six: Fatalism is the psychological feeling of individuals who perceive their behavior as being governed by oppressive rule or illegitimate authority.

Definition Seven: Anomia is the psychological feeling of individuals who either (1) do not perceive any norms, or (2) perceive ambiguity in the norms.

Definition Eight: Egoisia is the psychological feeling of individuals who experience role or status conflict because of strong attachments to at least two groups; they perceive conflict between norms.

These eight definitions are the only ones that appear in our classification. While we feel that most of them can be reasonably justified on the basis of our knowledge about different types of society, the stipulation of a particularistic-ascription normative pattern in the fatalistic society appears to be on weaker grounds than the other definitions.

The first eight hypotheses in this model are divided into two sets: (1) those that relate social context to mode of adaptation and (2) those that simultaneously relate social context, modes of adaptation, and deviance rates. The first set consists of the following four hypotheses:

Proposition One: Individuals in altruistic contexts are most likely to make an adaptation of conformity, but among those making deviant adaptations, it is predicted that the largest proportion will make an adaptation of ritualism.

Proposition Two: Individuals in fatalistic contexts are most likely to make an adaptation of conformity, but among those making deviant adaptations, it is predicted that the largest proportion will make an adaptation of rebellion.

Proposition Three: Individuals in anomic contexts are most likely to make an adaptation of conformity, but among those making deviant adaptations, it is predicted that the largest proportion will make an adaptation of "apathetic" retreatism. (Since we will be using the rebellion mode throughout this discussion, our comments about the mode of retreatism will refer only to the mutually-exclusive type, "apathetic" retreatism, which is described in Chapter II. To distinguish the two, we will call the first, "retreatism" and the latter, "apathetic retreatism".)

Proposition Four: Individuals in egoistic contexts are most likely to make an adaptation of conformity, but among those making deviant adaptations, it is predicted that the largest proportion will make an adaptation of innovation.

The findings in our study, of course, have relevance for only Proposition Four. The first half of this proposition was not supported by our data; because we found that in the egoistic context of a high school system, most of the students were innovators, not conformists. This result, however, necessarily confirms the second half of this proposition: innovation was the largest of the three deviant adaptations used in our study.

It is important to note that rates of deviance are not predicted in any one of the above propositions; those hypotheses are completely independent of the rates of deviance occurring in the various social contexts. The second set of hypotheses, Propositions Five through Eight, however, do incorporate rates of deviance in their relationships:

Proposition Five: In altruistic contexts, individuals making an adaptation of ritualism are most likely to exhibit the highest rates of deviant behavior.

Proposition Six: In fatalistic contexts, individuals making an adaptation of rebellion are most likely to exhibit the highest rates of deviant behavior.

Proposition Seven: In anomic contexts, individuals making an adaptation of "apathetic" retreatism are most likely to exhibit the highest rates of deviant behavior.

Proposition Eight: In egoistic contexts, individuals making an adaptation of innovation are most likely to exhibit the highest rates of deviant behavior.

Our data lend strong support to Proposition Eight, since innovators were found to bear the greatest pressures for cheating among four role types. On the whole, however, the rates of cheating by innovators and retreatists appeared to be about the same. Thus innovators were found to exhibit the highest rate of deviance, but those rates were matched by the deviance rates of retreatists.

Propositions Nine through Twelve relate social context with psychological state. Although these relationships appear to be tautological, they are not. While psychological state is hypothesized as being strongly related to social context, they are considered to be variables that are independent of one another.

Proposition Nine: The degree of altrusia experienced by individuals is positively related to the degree of altruism in the larger context.

Proposition Ten: The degree of fatalism experienced by individuals is positively related to the degree of fatalism in the larger context.

Proposition Eleven: The degree of anomia experienced by individuals is positively related to the degree of anomie in the larger context.

Proposition Twelve: The degree of egoisia experienced by individuals is positively related to the degree of egoism in the larger context.

Despite our objections, we are certain that these propositions will be said to be definitions; therefore, we will present one example to demonstrate that a high degree of an attribute among individuals need not lead to a high degree of that attribute in the context, as a whole. For this purpose we will use Proposition Nine, and will specify to indicate a condition under which that proposition is refuted.

Suppose that in a military batallion, soldiers have a stronger attachment to their particular sub-divisions than to the over-all unit (the batallion). If intense rivalry and enmity develop between the various sub-units, a high. . degree of group allegiance (or ritualism) does not result on the level of the batallion from the high degree of group allegiance among the members of the sub-units. In fact, a high degree of cleavage develops within the batallion as a whole. In short, the assertion: that strong cohesion among individual members of a sub-group is most likely to prevail in a larger context that has a high degree of cohesion (between it various sub-groups, that is) is a hypothesis, not a definition. The degree of cohesion on the individual and collectivity levels vary independently of one another. These are the kinds of relationships that are depicted in Propositions Nine through Twelve. Blau provides a number of empirical examples of the various kinds of relationships between similar attributes on the individual and collectivity levels in his treatment of "structural effects".[3]

Component E (in our classification scheme on page I-29) comprises various kinds of deviance (like military suicides) which are hypothesized as occurring most frequently in a particular social context. Since we will not list specific hypotheses for each example, we will present two propositions that set the general tone of these propositions:

Proposition Thirteen: Cheating on examinations is more likely to be a result of normative, role, or status conflicts than any other source of deviance (such as group allegiance, oppressive rule, or the absence or ambiguity of norms.)

Although cheating can and does occur as a result of some of the other sources of deviance, we hypothesize that most often it will be a consequence of conflict between norms. Therefore, while cheating on exams can and does occur in contexts of altruism, fatalism, and anomie, as well as in the context of egoism, we hypothesize that egoism is the most appropriate context to study this form of deviant behavior.

Proposition Fourteen: Gang delinquency is more likely to be the result of group allegiance than any other source of deviance (such as role or status conflicts, oppression, or the absence or ambiguity of norms.)

Therefore, we hypothesize that of the four social contexts, the state of altruism is most appropriate for studying gang delinquency. At the same time, however, it should be stressed that, depending upon the particular objectives of the investigator, gang delinquency can be fruitfully examined within any one of the other three contexts, as well.

In short, the examples of deviant behavior listed under component E for each of the four contexts are not restricted to those contexts; the same forms of deviance can occur in any one of the four contexts. We have only attempted to hypothesize the context in which certain kinds of deviance are most likely to occur.

To further clarify this discussion, we will now present hypothetical findings that confirm Propositions One through Nine. Let it be assumed that a hypothetical empirical study was able to examine the distribution of role adaptations and rates of deviance in all four social contexts, simultaneously. Table XI.1 relates social context to mode of adaptation; and Table XI.2 relates social context, mode of adaptation and deviance rates.

The base figures in Table XI.1 indicate that each of the four social contexts has a total of 1000 members. And in each of these contexts, as predicted, the largest proportion of the individuals make an adaptation of conformity. The proportion of conformists range from 55 per cent in anomic contexts to 70 per cent in fatalistic contexts and 75 per cent in altruistic contexts. Looking at the row percentages, among only the deviant adaptations, we find that a different deviant adaptation prevails in a different context. For example, in altruistic contexts, 10 per cent of the individuals are ritualists, but only 5 per cent are innovators, "apathetic" retreatists, or rebels; this result confirms Proposition One.

Also, in the fatalistic context, the highest proportion of those making deviant adaptations are the rebels; for 15 per cent of the members are rebels, but only 5 per cent are ritualists, innovators, or "apathetic" retreatists. This result therefore confirms Proposition Two. Propositions Three and Four are similarly confirmed.

TABLE XI.1

Mode of Adaptation By Social Context

(Per Cent of Individuals Making Various Adaptations)

		SOCIAL	CONTEXT	
MODE OF ADAPTATION	Altruism	Fatalism	Egoism	Anomie
Conformists	75%	70%	60%	55%
Ritualists	10	5	5	5
Innovators	5	5	25	5
"Apathetic" Retreatists	5	5	5	30
Rebels	5	15	5	5
N	(1000)	(1000)	(1000)	(1000)

TABLE XI.2

Rates of Deviance By Mode of Adaptation and Social Context

(Per Cent Exhibiting Deviant Behavior)

		SOCIAL	CONTEXT	
MODE OF ADAPTATION	Altruism	Fatalism	Egoism	Anomie
Conformists	15% (750)	20% (700)	25% (600)	30% (500)
Ritualists	35 (100)	25 (50)	20 (50)	15 (50)
Innovators	20 (50)	30 (50)	40 (250)	25 (50)
"Apathetic" Retreatists	25 (50)	36 (50)	35 (50)	45 (300)
Rebels	30 (50)	40 (150)	30 (50)	35 (100)

In Table XI.2, the hypothetical findings confirm Propositions Five through Eight. In the altruistic context, for example, the highest rates of deviance (35 per cent), as predicted, are exhibited by ritualists, while the highest rates of deviance (40 per cent) in the fatalistic context are exhibited by rebels. Similarly, innovators and "apathetic" retreatists exhibit the highest rates of deviance (of 40 per cent and 45 per cent, respectively) in the contexts of egoism and anomie, respectively.

The hypothetical findings presented in Tables XI.1 and XI.2 have important implications for future theoretical and empirical analyses of deviance. They indicate that researchers have the option of either (1) examining rates of deviance and distributions of role adaptations within one social context or (2) in two or more social contexts, simultaneously.

Consequently, there should be two approaches to our classification scheme: an empirical testing of some of its major propositions and a theoretical examination of the distinguishing characteristics of the four contexts.

The latter effort is essential because a number of investigators like Barclay Johnson have not found clear boundaries between Durkheim's contexts. In fact, Johnson offers the novel view that: (1) the states of egoism and anomie are one and the same, and that (2) the states of altruism and fatalism should be dropped from Durkheim's types.[4] Unfortunately, Johnson's reformulation of the societal types is restricted to only one type of deviance -- suicides; he reduces the four types of suicide to one. Thus his reformulation is not as general as Dohrenwend's. (We also found it surprising that Johnson failed to cite Dohrenwend's article at any point during his discussion.) Nevertheless, Johnson's article poses a question which we have not gone into in our presentation: "Can Durkheim's four types be reduced?" Johnson argues that they can be reduced when it comes to suicide rates; efforts must be made to determine whether this reduction can take place for other forms of deviance as well.

In sum, our classification scheme provides alternative contexts for the study of deviance. Its propositions should be empirically tested and its definitions challenged. At the same time, efforts should be made to determine whether or not certain of these contexts are superfluous.

Mode of Individual Adaptation

We feel that our findings justify the consideration of Merton's modes of adaptation as a new intervening or independent variable in empirical and theoretical analyses of deviant behavior. Up to now these types have only been examined as dependent variables in theoretical investigations.

Before Merton's paradigm can be effectively operationalized, however, the overlap between the modes of retreatism and rebellion must be rectified. Essentially, investigators have three alternatives: (1) drop rebellion from the paradigm and use only the remaining four types, as was done in our study; (2) retain the rebellion mode, but assign retreatism the notation for "apathetic" retreatism; (3) sub-divide the adaptations of conformity, ritualism, innovation, and retreatism by introducing the two "substitute" dimensions of alternative goals and means, thereby creating 16 modes of adaptation.

Our findings also permit us to derive implications for three aspects of Merton's typology: (1) the relative size of the adaptations, (2) the socioeconomic origins of the adaptations and (3) the distinctive features of each mode of adaptation.

1) Relative Size: Merton asserted that the adaptation of conformity should comprise the largest number of members in a social context; he also suggested that the adaptation of retreatism should have the fewest members. We found, however that most students were innovators, not conformists; furthermore, the adaptation of ritualism, not retreatism had the fewest members.

This discrepancy between Merton's predictions and our findings appear to be due to two important differences in each: (1) Merton was referring to adaptations to the goal of monetary success, while our study dealt with adaptations to the goal of academic success; and (2) Merton's observations apply to adaptations of individuals in the society-at-large; but ours apply to adaptations in the sub-system of a school. Thus it appears that Merton's statements on the relative size of the adaptations are contingent on (1) the particular goal selected for study, and (2) the particular setting in which behavior is observed.

2) Socio-Economic Origins: Merton hypothesized that (1) conformists would be most likely to come from the upper-middle class; (2) that ritualists would be most likely to come from the lower-middle class; and (3) that innovators would be most likely to come from the lower-class. Our data completely confirmed the first two propositions; the data also showed that the lower-class was not primary, but an important secondary source for the recruitment of innovators. The retreatists, whose social class origins were not predicted by Merton, were shown to be recruited largely from the "middle-middle" class strata. Thus it appears that the socio-economic origins of the role types remain constant regardless of the different context and different cultural goal under examination. Further empirical analyses are needed to determine whether these social origins, in fact, remain constant under different conditions.

3) Distinctive Features: The ritualist was described as exhibit "over-conforming" behavior; but our findings are inconclusive on this point because of the ambiguity in the concept "over-conforming." If, by this term, Merton meant that ritualists are more likely to exhibit lower rates of deviance than conformists, then our data strongly contradict this assertion. But, if by this term, he meant that ritualists are more likely to exhibit lower rates

of deviance than either innovators and retreatists, but less likely to exhibit lower rates of deviance than conformists, then our data provide strong support for this proposition.

The retreatist, among other things, was described as an "outcast" or "pariah"; but in our study we found the retreatists to be the most popular of the role types. This discrepancy also seems to be a result of a shift in goals (from monetary to academic success) and setting (from society-at-large to a high school system). While a person who retreats from the goal of monetary success does appear to be a "pariah," the student who retreats from the goal of academic success but substitutes the goal of social success (such as sports and dating) is the antithesis of an "outcast." Hence the high peer group status held by academic retreatists.

This finding also alerts us to the fact that it is not necessary to make alternative goals and means part of the definition of the typology in order to assess its relevance for role behavior. By keeping the goal of social success distinct from the typology, we were still able to demonstrate the powerful impact it had upon the behavior of students. Thus for many purposes, it seems that alternative goals and means should be treated as a variable for empirical verification, rather than as part of the definition of the typology. For when illegitimate alternative means are made part of the definition of an adaptation, then the relationship between that mode of adaptation and deviance is tautological.

Merton suggested that the greatest pressures for deviance are most likely to bear upon innovators; this hypothesis which we consider to be one of the most crucial in the theory of anomie is completely supported by our findings. For example, innovators were the only role type for which I.Q. and grades had no effect on their cheating behavior; they continued to exhibit high rates of cheating regardless of their grades or ability. We already noted above that our data strongly support Merton's assertion that innovators exhibit the highest rates of deviance among all the role types.

Social Class and Deviance

What are probably the most fundamental propositions in Merton's theory of social structure and anomie are those relating social class to pressures for deviance and to rates of deviance. These propositions appear to assert a linear negative relationship between these variables. But our findings clearly indicate that the relation between social class and deviance pressures is not linear, but curvilinear; the greatest pressures for cheating appeared to be among the "middle-middle" and the "lower-middle" strata, rather than among the "lower-class" strata. Furthermore, there was virtually no difference between the cheating rate of the medium-income strata and low-income strata. Thus cheating can be considered to be a type of "white-collar crime" among students, since there is greater pressure for cheating upon the "more privileged" than the "less privileged" group of students.

The relationship between social class and deviance is also specified by another of our findings. In Chapter VI, we noted, to our surprise, that cheating rates increased with the social class status of the community (or of the high school); rates of cheating were highest in the high SES community contexts. Because our sample of students comprised only two classes in the tenth grade, it was felt that these findings could have resulted from a bias in our sampling design; therefore we considered these findings to be inconclusive. But a study by Litwak and Meyer which was based upon representative samplings in the community also found academic deviance to be greater in the high than the low SES neighborhoods.[5] This inquiry, which examined the role behavior of fifth and sixth graders throughout Detroit, found that delinquency rates were negatively related to neighborhood SES, but that cheating rates were positively related to neighborhood social-class composition. We present two of these findings in Table XI.3.

TABLE XI.3

Delinquency and Cheating By Neighborhood SES: Litwak-Meyer Data[b]

(Per Cent Reporting Misbehavior)

Median Income of Achievement Normed Neighborhood	Steal Things[a] From Stores	(2 or more times) Copies Off Someone Else's Paper	N
Low ($3,366)	22%	36%	(345)
Moderately Low ($4,225)	22%	37%	(672)
Moderately High ($7,150)	13%	49%	(344)
High ($8,350)	15%	58%	(169)

[a] Per Cent reporting one or more times in the last year.

[b] Source: Eugene Litwak and Henry J. Meyer, "Relationship Between School-Community Coordinating Procedures and Reading Achievement," U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1966, p. 52

This study also found that 36 per cent of those living in "low" SES neighborhoods reported that they had "made trouble for the teacher one or more times in the last year," but 48 per cent of those living in "high" (that is, in the $8,350 category) SES neighborhood reported that they had also made trouble for the teacher once or more within the last year. On the other hand, none of the students living in the "high" SES neighborhood reported having had trouble with the police once or more within the last year, but 17 per cent of those living in the "low" SES neighborhoods reported having had trouble with the police. Thus non-academic acts of delinquency appear to be negatively related to neighborhood SES, but academic deviance is positively related to neighborhood SES.

The Litwak-Meyer findings give us greater confidence in our finding that community SES was positively related to cheating rates. And since classroom SES was negatively related to cheating rates, we can assert that community SES and classroom SES have inverse effects on cheating; cheating decreases with an increase in classroom SES, but increases with an increase in community (or high school) SES.

We can now respecify Merton's propositions relating social class and deviance as follows:

1) Individual social class is curvilinearly related to pressures for cheating; the greatest pressures are found among the "middle-middle" and the "lower-middle" classes.

2) Individual social class is linearly related to rates of cheating; the rates are lowest among the upper-middle class, but there is no difference in the rates of the "middle-middle," "lower-middle," and "lower class" strata.

3) Classroom SES is linearly related to cheating, but the relationship is a negative one; the highest cheating rates are found within the classroom contexts with low SES composition.

4) Community (and high school) social class is linearly related to cheating, but the relationship is positive; the rates of cheating are higher in the high SES community contexts than in the low SES community contexts.

At this point, it should be noted that there is a strong tendency for studies (like Litwak and Meyer's and our own) whichare based on self-reports of deviance, not to find strong social class differences. Nye, Short, and Olsen who also employed self-reports in their investigation of delinquency observed:

.. . . .

> After an examination of this literature, it is the opinion of the writers that the use of a measure of reported delinquent behavior rather than official records of delinquency will yield results somewhat different from those supporting the traditional conceptions of the status distribution of delinquency. We are not here concerned with etiology, but with this question: Does delinquent behavior occur differentially by socioeconomic status?[6]

Thus we also feel that there is a need for empirical analyses of deviance that employ "subjective," as well as "objective" measures of deviant behavior.

Sample Design

Our discussion of social class and deviance also has important implications for the sample design of future studies. More studies of student role behavior, whether deviant or not, should employ cluster sampling within classroom contexts; for we found that classroom SES context had a greater impact upon student behavior than community (or high school) SES context. Most investigations of students that employ contextual measures, as a rule, go no lower than the SES context of the high school. Then, they usually conclude that students' aspirations, grades, etc., will increase if they attend high SES schools. But if students are placed in low SES classrooms in these high SES schools, the school SES context will have no effect on their aspirations or grades; they may, in fact, even decline. Therefore, there is a need for assessing the simultaneous effects of classroom and high school SES contexts on student behavior, attitudes, and aspirations.

Our community context variable that consisted of city, suburban, small town, and rural communities also proved to be very influential throughout our analysis. By having students from these various types of communities in our sample, we were able to examine rates of deviance between communities of different sizes, as well as within them. As a result, we found that: (1) the highest rates of cheating prevailed in the suburbs and small towns;

(2) that the greatest pressures for cheating existing among students from small towns; and (3) that role type had no effect on the cheating rate of students from small towns. Thus future studies using the role adaptations should also select their samples from communities of various sizes.

Adolescent Subcultures

By classifying the students into the four categories of Merton's role types, we were able to demonstrate a need for respecification of Coleman's adolescent subculture thesis.[7] Most critics of this thesis contend that the value dissensus between adolescents and adults is not as great as Coleman suggests. But the role types revealed the existence of two competing adolescent subcultures: the "academically-oriented" group of conformists and ritualists, and the "socially-oriented" crowd of retreatists. This competition between these two minorities of students caused the group in the middle--the innovators--to have an "ambivalent" orientation to the goals of academic and social success. Because the "typical" student is an innovator, the modal value-orientation of the adolescent subculture does not value social success over academic success; in fact, their ambivalence is responsible for their valuing both goals equally. But the polarity between the value preferences of conformists and retreatists revealed that the degree of value dissensus among adolescents was just as great and, sometimes, greater than the degree of value dissensus between adolescents and their parents. Consequently, the postulation of a subculture comprising adults and adolescents would be just as accurate as postulating a subculture that comprise only adolescents. Further investigations are needed to determine the range of the value preferences among adolescents with different role adaptations. Thus Merton's role types should also be incorporated into investigations of students' educational and occupational aspirations.

Paradigm of Deviance

The analysis in Chapter X demonstrated that social context, social interaction, and role adaptations, when simultaneously employed, have strong independent effects upon cheating rates. The separate effects of these factors were examined in the earlier chapters. The implications that these findings have for future investigations of deviance are clear: deviant behavior cannot be accounted for solely in terms of either (1) psychological (individual adaptations), or (2) social interactional (differential peer group associations), or (3) sociological (social context) factors. Assessments must be made of their interaction effects upon deviant behavior.

Additional Findings

The following is a list of other important findings in our analysis:

1) The statement: "Conformists exhibit lower rates of deviant behavior than deviants," is a hypothesis, not a definition.

2) The adaptation of conformity should be included in all analyses of deviance, since conformists also contribute to the range of deviant behavior.

3) Merton's assertion that innovators resort to illegitimate means is a hypothesis, not a definition of that adaptation.

4) With the exception of the rebellion mode, role adaptations and deviant behavior are not tautologically related.

5) The adaptations of retreatism and rebellion in Merton's paradigm are not mutually-exclusive.

6) Individual role adaptations can be considered as an indicator of individual anomia (or, in our terms, egoisia) and vice versa; thus "deviants" can be equated with "anomics," and "conformists" with

"non-anomics."

7) An aggregated measure of individual role adaptations can be used as an indicator of collective anomie (or, in our terms, egoism).

8) The two dimensions of Merton's role typology are (a) the degree of commitment to culture goals and (b) the degree of utilization of legitimate means.

9) The adaptations of conformity, ritualism, innovation and retreatism constitute an ordinal scale of deviance: there is a linear increase in deviance rates as one goes from conformity to retreatism.

10) Grades do not increase, but decrease with frequency of cheating; thus rates of cheating should be considered as a consequence of grades, not vice versa.

11) Innovators and conformists who cheat have just as high grades as innovators and conformists who do not cheat; but ritualists and retreatists who cheat have much lower grades than ritualists and retreatists who do not cheat.

12) The rate of cheating among students enrolled in college preparatory courses is just as high as the rate of cheating among students enrolled in commercial, general, and vocational courses.

13) Cheating rate decreases the stronger the classroom climate of peer disapproval.

14) Students who perceive strong peer group disapproval of cheating are less likely to cheat than those students who perceive weak peer disapproval of cheating.

15) Students whose peer associates over-participate in studies and extracurricular activities are less likely to cheat than students whose peer associates over-participate in sports and dating.

16) Conformists and ritualists holding high status positions (that is, is either a member of the leading crowd or is "more" popular) among their peers are *less* likely to cheat than innovators and retreatists holding low status positions.

18) Peer group status is strongly related to family social class: those from high SES backgrounds are more likely to hold high status positions among their peers than those from low SES backgrounds.

19) Peer group associations are strongly related to family SES: high SES students are more likely to participate in studies and extra-curricular activities than low SES students; but high SES students are just as likely to participate in sports and dating as low SES students.

20) Boys participate in extra-curricular activities and dating *just as often* as girls. But girls participate more in studies, while boys participate more in sports.

Footnotes

1. William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964).

2. Allen H. Barton, "The Concept of Property-Space in Social Research," in Paul Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.) Language of Social Research, (New York: Free Press, 1955), p. 40-53; Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Evidence and Inference in Social Research," Daedalus, Summer, 1958, pp. 99-130.

3. Peter M. Blau, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, XXV, (April, 1960), pp. 178-193.

4. Barclay D. Johnson, "Durkheim's One Cause of Suicide," American Sociological Review, XXX (December, 1965), pp. 875-886.

5. Eugene Litwak and Henry J. Meyer, "Relationship Between School-Community Coordinating Procedures and Reading Achievement," U. S. Department of Education, Bureau of Research, Washington, D.C., 1966. We have Dr. David E. Wilder to thank for bringing these findings to our attention.

6. F. Ivan Nye, James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olson, "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (January, 1958), pp. 381-389.

7. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: Free Press, 1961).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barber, Bernard, Social Stratification. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1957).

2. Bendix, Reinhard and S. M. Lipset (eds.), Class, Status and Power. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1953).

3. Berg, I. and B. M. Bass (eds.), Conformity and Deviation. (New York: Harper, 1961).

4. Blau, Peter M., "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review XXV (1960), 178-193.

5. Boocock, Sarane S., "Toward a Sociology of Learning," Sociology of Education, XXXIX, No. 1 (Winter 1966), 1-45.

6. Borgotta, E. F., "Analysis of Social Interaction and Sociometric Perception," Sociometry, XVII (1954), 7-31.

7. Bowers, William J.,"Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College," Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964.

8. Bressler, Marvin and Charles Westoff, "The Concept of Social Mobility," American Sociological Review, XXV (June 1960), 378-385.

9. Bronfenbrenner, Urie, "The Measurement of Sociometric Status, Structure, and Development," Sociometry Monographs, No. 6 (New York: Beacon House, 1945), 29-35.

10. Buswell, M. M., "The Relationship Between the Social Structure of the Classroom and the Academic Success of the Pupils," Journal of Experimental Education, XXII (1954), 37-52.

11. Byrd, Eugene, "Validity and Constancy of Choices in a Sociometric Test," Sociometry, XIV (1951), 175-181.

12. Cartwright, Dorwin and A. Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics. (Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson, 1962).

13. Chowdhry, Kamla and T. M. Newcomb, "The Relative Abilities of Leaders and Non-Leaders to Estimate Opinions of Their Own Groups," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 51-57.

14. Clinard, Marshall B., Sociology of Deviant Behavior. (New York: Rinehart, 1957).

15. Cloward, Richard A., "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), 164-176.

16. ______ and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961).

17. Cohen, Albert K., Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955).

18. ______, "The Study of Social Disorganization and Deviant Behavior," R. K. Merton, et al. (eds.), Sociology Today. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), Vol. 2.

19. ______, "The Sociology of the Deviant Act," American Sociological Review, XXX (1965), 5-15.

20. Coleman, James S., The Adolescent Society. (New York: Free Press, 1961).

21. ______, "The Adolescent Subculture and Academic Achievement," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (January 1960), 337-347.

22. ______, "Relational Analysis: the Study of Social Organizations with Survey Methods," A. Etzioni (ed.) Complex Organizations. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), 441-453.

23. Criswell, Joan H., A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom, Psychological Archives (1939), No. 235.

24. ______, "Sociometric Methods in Measuring Group Preferences," Sociometry, VI (November 1943), 398-408.

25. ______, "The Measurement of Group Integration," In J. L. Moreno, et al., The Sociometry Reader. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), 252-265.

26. Dentler, Robert and Mary E. Warshauer, Big City Dropouts. (New York Center for Urban Education, 1965).

27. Dubin, Robert, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure," American Sociological Review, XXIV, No. 2 (April 1959), 147-164.

28. Duncan, Otis D., "Properties and Characteristics of the Socioeconomic Index," in Albert J. Reiss (ed.), Occupations and Social Status. (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), 139-161.

29. Eisman, Bernice, "Some Operational Measures of Cohesiveness and Their Inter-relations," Human Relations, XII (1959), 183-189.

30. Elder, Glen H., "Family Structure and Educational Attainment," American Sociological Review,(XXX (February, 1965), 81-96.

31. Elkin, Frederick and William A. Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," American Sociological Review, XX (December 1955), 680-684.

32. Ellis, Robert A. and W. Clayton Lane, "Structural Supports for Upward Mobility," American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 5 (October 1963), 743-756.

33. Fiedler, Fred E., Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1958).

34. Fox, Robert, et al., Tools for the Study and Diagnosis of Classroom Learning Atmospheres (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1965).

35. Gibb, Cecil, "The Sociometry of Leadership in Temporary Groups," in A. Paul Hare, Edgar F. Borgotta, and Robert F. Bales (eds.) Small Groups (New York: Knopf, 1965), 658-674, revised edition.

36. Gordon, C. W., The Social System of the High School (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

37. Goslin, David A., The School in Contemporary Society (Keystone of Education, Education Series, 1965).

38. Gottlieb, David and Jon Reeves, Adolescent Behavior in Urban Areas (New York: Free Press, 1963), 54-75.

39. Gronlund, Norman E., Sociometry in the Classroom (New York Harper, 1959).

40. Gross, Neal, et al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1958).

41. Hartley, Eugene L. and Alexander Mintz, "A Technique for the Study of the Dynamics of the Racial Saturation Point," Sociometry, IX (February 1946), 14-20.

42. Hatt, Paul K., "Occupation and Social Stratifcation," American Journal of Sociology, LV (1950), 533-543.

43. Havighurst, Robert and B. Neugarten, "The Family, Peer Group and School as a Social System," Society and Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962), 91-172.

44. Hollingshead, A. B., Elmtown's Youth (New York: Wiley, 1949).

45. Hyman, Herbert H., "The Value Systems of Different Classes," in Bendix and Lipset, op. cit., 426-442.

46. Kahl, J. A., "Education and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, XXIII (1953), 186-203.

47. ______, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957).

48. Katz, Elihu, "The Two-Step Flow of Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXI, No. 1 (1957), 61-78.

49. ______ and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955).

50. Lazarsfeld, Paul F.,"Evidence and Inference in Social Research," Daedalus (Summer, 1958), 99-130.

51. ______ and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relations Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Etzioni, op. cit., 422-440.

52. Lazarsfeld, Paul, et al., The People's Choice (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).

53. Levenson, Bernard, "Bureaucratic Succession," in Etzioni, op. cit.

54. Lipset, Seymour and R. Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959).

55. Lundberg, George A. and Lenore Dickson, "Inter-Ethnic Relations in High School Population," American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (1952), 1-10.

56. ______, "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population," American Sociological Review, XVII (February, 1952), 23-35.

57. McClelland, David C., et al., The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953).

58. Merton, Robert K., "Social Structure and Anomie," Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), 131-194, revised edition.

59. ______, "Social Conformity, Deviation and Opportunity Structures," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), 177-189.

60. ______, "Social Problems and Sociological Theory," in R. K. Merton and Robert Nisbet (eds.), Contemporary Social Problems (New York: Harcourt, 1961), 697-737.

61. Miller, Leonard M., "The Dropout: Schools Search for Clues to His Problems," School Life, (May 1963), 2-5.

62. Moreno, J. L., "Statistics of Social Configurations," Sociometry Monographs, No. 3, (Beacon House, New York) January--April, 1938.

63. ______, Who Shall Survive? (Washington, D.C.: Nervous and Mental Publishing Co., 1934).

64. National Opinion Research Center (NORC), "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Bendix and Lipset, op. cit., 411-426.

65. Newcomb, Theodore M., "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study," in G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Holt, 1952), 420-430.

66. ______, "Student Peer Group Influences," in N. Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: Wiley, 1962), 469-488.

67. Parsons, Talcott, "Deviance and Social Control," Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951), Chapter 7.

68. Rosen, Bernard C., "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, XXI (April 1956), 203-211.

69. Strodtbeck, Fred L., "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," in David C. McClelland, et al., Talent and Society (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1958).

70. Taguiri, R., and L. Petrullo (eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958), 353-379.

71. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), revised edition.

72. Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: Wiley, 1932).

73. Warner, W. Lloyd, et al., Who Shall Be Educated? (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960).

74. Whyte, William F., Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

75. Wilder, David E. and Thomas P. Wilson, "Codification of Emergent Problems Associated with the Use of Surveys to Collect Sociometric and Other Relational Data for the Analysis of Social Systems," (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, October 14, 1964), mimeo.

76. Wilson, Alan B., "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December 1959), 836-845.

77. ______, "Social Stratification and Academic Achievement," in A. Harry Passow, Education in Depressed Areas (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), 217-235.

78. Withall, John and W. W. Lewis, "Social Interaction in the Classroom," in N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), 683-714.